THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XIV FEBRUARY 1943 No. 2

THE KARMA OF NATIONS

The Law of Cause and Effect operates universally and impersonally. Not only in the visible but also on the moral and mental planes where its workings are not so easily determinable as on the physical. Just as chemists have determined how two elements, Oxygen and Hydrogen, combining in certain proportions produce the effect, water, so can super-chemists know the causal forces which produce, as effects, psychical and psychological phenomena of love or lunacy, charity or miserliness. The ancient Sages named the Law Karma, which term means "effect-producing cause." As it encompasses the mind and the heart of man it is defined as the unerring Law of Retribution. One important aspect of this Law is related to nations. Nations, like men, have their Karma. No nation or nations can escape their Karmic fate any more than can units or individuals.

Karma has been mistaken for fatalism, which implies a blind course of some still blinder power; but man is a free agent during his stay on earth. Destiny may be described as the effects of actions performed in the past, but destiny is *self-made*. To take a homely example, having freely chosen to eat a particular kind of food a man is compelled to digest what he has eaten. Indigestion may awaken him to secure a prescription to alleviate the pain but, if he has not been intelligent enough to connect his discomfort with the food he has taken, he very likely will go again to the same menu and again will experience pain.

The same process obtains in the operation of National Karma. A nation's destiny is the effect produced in the present by causes generated in the past. Neither angels nor devas punish or reward, with or without God's or Allah's permission or order, but man himself—his deeds or Karma, may attract, individually and collectively (as in the case of whole nations, say, at the present

time), every kind of evil and calamity.

Knowledge of the Law of Karma enables us to understand such events as the present war which directly affects some nations and indirectly all others. Absence of that knowledge misleads us in evaluating the cause and meaning of this ghastly experience. Those who have studied not only the general principles but also the detailed workings of the Law and are capable of calculating the nature and mass of the forces set into motion by any nation are in a position to predict or to prophesy the fate awaiting it; yet in the prognostication of such future events no psychic phenomenon is involved. Wrote H. P. Blavatsky in 1888 :—

It is neither *prevision, nor prophecy;* no more than is the signalling of a comet or star, several years before its appearance. It is simply knowledge and mathematically correct computations which enable the WISE MEN OF THE EAST to foretell, for instance, that England is on the eve of such or another catastrophe; France, nearing such a point of her cycle, and Europe in general threatened with, or rather, on the eve of, a cataclysm, which her own cycle of racial *Karma has led her* to.—*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 646.

But does this imply that the evil and wickedness of this war must be silently endured and that nothing can be done? That would be following the philosophy of Fatalism, not of Karma. Fighting Hitlerism may be compared to the man's securing a prescription for his pain; the overthrow of Hitlerism may bring this particular war to a close, but will not teach the United Nations the cause of the prevailing ghastliness, any more than their defeat will bring sense and wisdom to the Axis Powers. If the cycle of war and strife is to end in Europe, in the Occident or in the whole of the world, that aspect of Karma which is related to Brotherhood must be understood.

Causation and Unity of and in Nature are most intimately connected. In a man's personal life, as also in a nation's life, evil and suffering can be overcome only by uprooting the weeds of competition, of ambition, of lust, of wrath, of greed. The great Buddha's axiomatic teaching, which He named the Eternal Law, is that "Hatred ceases not by Hatred but by Love." This is recognised by any thoughtful and intelligent observer of events in his own life. It is not so easy to perceive the working of this principle in national and international affairs. And yet if, putting aside only for an hour the details of bombings, of ration tickets, even of ideologies, we contemplated the principles of life and evolution we should readily see that the Law of Nature cannot but work incessantly to restore disturbed harmony, no less in collective than in personal life.

The only decree of Karma—an eternal and immutable decree—is absolute Harmony in the world of matter as it is in the world of Spirit. It is not, therefore, Karma that rewards or punishes, but it is we, who reward or

punish ourselves according to whether we work with, through and along with nature, abiding by the laws on which that Harmony depends, or—break them. Nor would the ways of Karma be inscrutable were men to work in union and harmony, instead of disunion and strife. For our ignorance of those ways—which one portion of mankind calls the ways of Providence, dark and intricate; while another sees in them the action of blind Fatalism; and a third, simple chance, with neither gods nor devils to guide them—would surely disappear, if we would but attribute all these to their correct cause....Were no man to hurt his brother, Karma-Nemesis would have neither cause to work for, nor weapons to act through. It is the constant presence in our midst of every element of strife and opposition, and the division of races, nations, tribes, societies and individuals into Cains and Abels, wolves and lambs, that is the chief cause of the "ways of Providence." We cut these numerous windings in our destinies daily with our own hands, while we imagine that we are pursuing a track on the royal high-road of respectability and duty, and then complain of those ways being so intricate and so dark....

This state will last till man's spiritual intuitions are fully opened.... until we begin acting from *within*, instead of ever following impulses from *without;* namely, those produced by our physical senses and gross selfish body. (*Ibid.*, I. 643-4)

This "acting from within" implies a new attitude to international problems. Only those minds which free themselves from the prevailing disease of false patriotism, which see the immorality of benefiting one's country at the expense of another, which recognise that humanity is one and that injury to a single part, however small, means harm to the whole body—those minds alone are the true benefactors of humanity. Every leader in every nation is a channel for the manifestation of the national Karma. The manner in which he meets the evil now enveloping his people must determine the future of his nation and unless he turns it into a force for good he will ill serve them. To transform evil into good he must abandon on behalf of his nation the old mistaken path of selfishness, ambition and competition and take to considering the good of the whole, including the part which his own country is. If "the whole past of the Earth is nothing but an unfolded present," as Büchner pointed out, the converse is equally true—tomorrow in its turn will be the unfolding of today. And so what is thought and planned now, what is said and done now, will unerringly produce in time its harvest of sweet fruits or poison plants.

It is a fashion nowadays to point to the Peace of Versailles as the cause of the present carnage. But unless the point is driven home and plans are made to abandon the ideas which created Versailles, there can be no lasting peace. What created Versailles? Pride, ambition, greed on the part of the victors; and their folly brought to birth Mussolini and Hitler and their like. The ancient doctrine of Karma needs to be studied by modern men if a truly New World Order is to arise.

ETHICS AS THE BASIS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

[We agree with **Shrimati M. A. Ruckmini,** an advocate of Madras, that the way out, for the world as for the individual, is the ethics of altruism, the application in practice of the unchanging spiritual verities.—ED.]

Since the dawn of civilisation, mankind has too often relied on brute physical force for the settlement of international claims and conflicts, with the result that precious lives and property are lost in merciless mass-murders and massacres. I propose in the following paragraphs to argue a plea for Ethics as the one basis for International Law. Diverse as have been the metaphysical theories and schools of philosophy since man began to probe into the mysteries of Nature and of Existence, one striking feature in the bewildering maze of speculation is the subterranean current of thought running through all these different channels of intellection, *i.e.*, the remarkable discovery that man is not to be identified with his body, mind and senses, but with something above all these—call it Atman, Consciousness, God, or by whatever other name; and that all men in their essential nature are only manifestations of the Infinite, the primal source and abode of everything, including consciousness.

This ultimate principle of the Universe, the nature of man's self and the relation of one human being to another of his species—these have resulted in a code of conduct which regulates the activities and the behaviour of men. That science of conduct has been called Ethics. The aim of Ethics is to show how best men should lead their lives, to point out what distinguishes men from animals, and to guide in proper directions the cognitions, emotions and volitions, mind and body and senses, in accordance with the supreme spiritual ideal to be achieved. In the words of the *Bhagavad-Gita,*

> Whosoever regards the happiness or misery of another person, even as he does his own, he is to be regarded as the best of Yogis.

Again, in another stanza we read :—

> He whose mind is steadfast in yoga, sees his own self in all creatures and all creatures in his own self, for he sees God in all.

The necessity for Ethics has been felt to be absolutely compelling and obligatory. From time immemorial, there has been no system of thought that has not dwelt on Ethics side by side with metaphysics. We see ideas of good conduct underlying Plato's *Republic*; and Herbert Spencer's *Inductions of Ethics* is well known. Even the Advaita school of philosophy, which regards the world as only an illusory phenom-

enon, is not without its own code of Ethics. Buddhism went to the extreme of emphasising active Ethical principles and doctrines of Right Conduct even at the risk of relegating to a secondary place the metaphysical quest and theories. Mahatma Gandhi in our own day has stated, in his laconic style, that "my service to my people is part of the discipline to which I submit myself in order to free my soul from the bonds of flesh." Tagore's absolute emphasis on Ethics is thus expressed :—

Our love of life is really our wish to continue our relation with this great world. This relation is one of love. We are bound to the world with a deeper and truer bond than that of necessity ; our soul is drawn to it.

This reminds one of Coleridge's view :—

A love which beginning in the cradle binding him to his mother, widens in ever broadening circles as life enlarges, including the children of the home, the villagers, the tribe, the nation, at last reaching out and taking in the whole human race and learning that there is a still larger life in which we live, move, and have our being, towards which we tend and by which we are led and inspired.

In utterances like these we find the swinging of the pendulum from Religion to Ethics.

That this widening of consciousness has led to the *ethicisation* of the volitions of men can be realised in the evolution from individual to family, from family to nation, and from nation to federation. The mere recognition of pleasure as an object of individual aspiration is one-sided and does not fully satisfy the spiritual cravings of mankind. There should be an adequate outlet for spiritual energy in the satisfaction of other values as well. For instance, thirst for knowledge, desire for truth, love for art, beauty, etc., give a peculiar satisfaction to the mind, not afforded by tangible pleasures. On the other hand, the higher emotions of love, reverence, pity and friendship do not demand pleasure or satisfaction for oneself, but elicit an excruciating measure of suffering and sacrifice. So the consummation of all human action must be the living of a larger life, call it *Brahmee-sthiti* or by any other name.

If ethical conduct was found necessary even in primitive society when man had practically very little connection with the outside world, much more so is it an inescapable obligation at the present day, when whole nations are knit together, one way or the other, by various causes, scientific and cultural. The modern inventions of radio, telegraphic communication and the cheap printing-press make it absolutely impossible for one to shut his eyes to the outside world, even if he wants to do so. The threatening discoveries of destructive engines, poison-gas etc. prevent even the most philosophical nations like India, which had so long relegated material civilisation and political achievements to a secondary place, from sitting with

hands folded, as mere spectators. Even India has been unable to resist the cataclysmal force of circumstances threatening on all sides and is being led on to some sort of action, violent or non-violent, passive or aggressive, or whatever its nature may be. The Civil Disobedience Movement of Mahatma Gandhi is a glaring instance of the failure of mere speculative theories to satisfy the needs of men.

Man cannot rest content only with bliss promised in a future state of the world but wants here and now to satisfy the cravings of his human physiological and psychological make-up or constitution. That the spirit of vindictiveness, of suspicion, of fear and rivalry engendered by the war and which the provisions of peace-treaties have served to perpetuate and to foster, has led to an enormous increase of national competitive armaments which in its turn has accentuated the effects of world-wide depression and nervousness is a truth that even the most superficial observer would not fail to note. That a narrow and brutal nationalism which the post-war period of self-determination (so-called) has served to perpetuate and to reinforce has been chiefly responsible for the policy of high and prohibitive tariffs, so injurious to the healthy growth and flow of international trade and to the mechanism of finance and international wealth, is a fact which few would venture to dispute.

There is thus urgent and imperative need for the nations of the present day to act in conformity with the principles that would uplift the nations as a whole and not make one nation destroy another in cut-throat competition. This no one can deny. Here comes in the conception of International Law, *i. e.*, law governing the relations of nations with one another in their intercourse, political, economic and, above all, cultural and spiritual. There is a compelling and insistent need for a new world-order, a world organically united and unified in all its essential aspects and not disrupted by economic distress, political exploitation and confusion, financial crises and upheavals, religious restlessness and racial animosities which at present seem to conspire with one another to add immeasurably to the miseries and burdens of the war-weary world.

To arrive at such a dynamic and spiritual world order the following suggestions could be made :—

(1) The spirit of "I and mine" which the ancients so rightly described as the root of all evils has now taken the shape of narrow political consciousness and a possessive economic spirit. These should be cut at their very foundations—nipped in the bud. Ethical ideas like "God is truth" should be reversed to give greater force to the principle "Truth is God." This principle of truth conceived as love for all humanity should be injected into the life-blood of nations and should be made to circulate in the

veins of every modern dictator, so that he might be compelled to honour his peace-pacts.

(2) What one nation cherishes as ideals of freedom and democracy is equally necessary for other nations as well. This should be conceded and acted upon by all the nations. The Biblical dictum, "As you would that men should do to you, do you also to them" should be translated into effective action.

(3) More emphasis should be laid on duties than on rights. The deplorable tendency of modern times is for each nation to be ever more zealous in guarding its rights but not half so enthusiastic in discharging its duties to others.

(4) Finally, the spirit of true religion and ethics as expounded in the opening *mantra* of the *Isavasya-Upanishad* stands in urgent need of actually being lived in the daily conduct of all citizens of the world—politicians and economists, scientists and industrialists *not* excluded. The verse runs thus :—

By one supreme Ruler is this universe pervaded, every world in the whole circle of nature. Enjoy pure delight, O man! by abandoning all thoughts of this perishable world and covet not the wealth of any creature existing.

That the world is perishable needs no demonstration or proof in its present chaotic state. The gorgeous display of wealth, with all its direction in wrong channels, the licentious sensualism of ease and affluence, unsettle the balance of mind of the unsophisticated and plunge them into the sea of worldly ambitions and earthly anxieties of passion, hatred and jealousy. The tantalising thirst for possession and man's unquenchable desire for adding territory to territory only inflame his possessive inclinations all the more, like oblations of clarified butter poured into fire. Worst of all, this canker of desire blinds him to all the glorious and ennobling aspirations of an everlasting life, aspirations which spring from a conscious conviction that Nature, with her immutable laws and inexhaustible resources, is not a conglomeration of chance but is the positive edifice of an ever-active, moving spiritual principle. The second verse equally forcibly rallies all men under its banner by sounding the clarion call :—

Aspire thou, O Man! to live in virtuous deeds for a hundred years in peace with thy neighbours. Thus alone and not otherwise will thy deeds not contaminate thee.

But let not the glorification of this universal moral law be misunderstood as the subversion of the foundations of the existing social order. It seeks only to broaden its basis, to remould its institutions, in a manner consistent with the needs of an ever-changing world. It can conflict with no legitimate allegiances, nor can it undermine essential loyalties. Its purpose is neither to stifle the bright flame of patriotism in men's hearts, nor to extinguish the light of national autonomy. It does not ignore, nor does it attempt

to suppress the diversity of ethical origins, of climate, of history, of language and tradition, of thoughts and habits that differentiate the peoples and the nations of the world. It calls for a wider loyalty, for a larger aspiration than any that has till now animated or energised the human race. It insists on the subordination of national interests and impulses to the imperative claims of a unified world. It repudiates excessive centralisation on the one hand and disclaims all attempts at mechanised or mechanical monotony or uniformity on the other. Its watchword is "Unity-in-diversity." It is towards such a goal, the goal of a new world order, divine in origin as envisaged in the *Purusha-sukta*, all-embracing in its scope, equitable in its principles, challenging in its appeal, for which harassed humanity should strive.

Humanity has today strayed too far from the ancient ideals of love and spirituality. Pet theories and slogans of democracy and independence cannt save or redeem mankind. No scheme which the calculations of the highest statesmanship can devise, no doctrine which the most efficient economist can formulate, no principle which the most ardent moralist can inculcate, can discover the panacea for the ills of contemporary mankind. The poison of aggression and exploitation is slowly but steadily eating into the vitals of human society and civilisation and it is high time that really effective remedies were discovered. Political and economic theories will not do; Man is not merely an intellectual animal to be satisfied with scientific progress. He is above all a spiritual entity. Not merely the head, the heart also must be purified. The purified and practised perception of spiritual truths of the *Isavasya-Upanishad*, and their translation into daily life and conduct, would alone save mankind. Stern and rigorous moral discipline must prevail. Physical force must disappear. That is the pure, timeless, safe Aryan Path. The Kingdom of God can be reached only by those who have the perception and the courage to walk along the Aryan Path undeflected by distractions, disabilities and the myriad-shaped mundane hedonisms.

M. A. RUCKMINI

As a matter of fact, the geographical oneness of India is the least part of its unity which is organic and fundamental, rooted in a history and culture which extends far beyond the history and culture of any other country except China. Geographical unity may be broken, at least temporarily, by political action. More important, therefore, than geographical, more even than cultural, is that India is a spiritual unity. No statesman who does not appreciate that fact, can understand and appreciate at its full strength the passionate feeling of the Indian people against even the faintest idea of separating any part of it from the whole. Gentlemen to whom an immediate political gain has a facination far beyond its intrinsic worth may contemplate a compromise involving separation as worth the sacrifice. But that type of man does not represent the soul of the country.

Indian Social Reformer.

Æ: APOSTLE OF IRISH DEMOCRACY

[We publish here a tribute by **Mr. R. M. Fox,** who was privileged to know Æ, practical mystic and reformer with the vision that only spiritual quickening confers. An unwavering conviction of the realities of the Spirit underlay all his efforts. From his early contact with genuine Theosophy, Æ's loyalty to the vistas of Truth that it opened never wavered. John Stuart Mill was right when he declared that " One person with a belief is a social power equal to 99 who have only interests."—Ed.]

G. W. Russell (Æ) was a poet, a painter, a mystical philosopher and a man of affairs. In his weekly journal *The Irish Homestead* he devoted himself to the fostering of rural co-operation. He travelled throughout the country addressing gatherings of farmers in the villages and explaining the principles of co-operative organisation. He was engaged in this work for many years and all the time his reputation was growing as a man of force and originality.

After the Irish treaty settlement in London, Æ became Editor of *The Irish Statesman* and was enabled to turn his creative mind to larger and wider issues. He was called upon to advise the Government regarding the constitution of a Senate and recommended that it be formed on vocational lines with representation for all the various professions and callings.

His influence reached far beyond Ireland. Harvard and Yale Universities each conferred the honour of a degree upon him, while Dublin University made him a Doctor of Letters. He was invited to America to engage in an extensive lecture tour. But the most signal honour was paid to Æ when the U. S. Department of Agriculture asked him to come over to advise them on rural problems during a period of severe economic depression. He spent much time in Washington and saw many deputations from rural areas. At this time too—in January, 1935—he was asked to visit an Indian Reservation in New Mexico to instruct them in the principles of co-operation. Unfortunately, his health would not permit the journey and he died in England on July 17th of the same year.

Why was it that America asked for the services of this man from the far-off small country of Ireland ? What was novel in him as an economist, he was told in America, was that he never forgot that man was a human being, not just a number on a chart. Today, when we have vast schemes of mass production, mass organisation and regimentation, this quality which Æ possessed is sufficiently unique for us to investigate it further and to find out if possible how he came to hold such views.

Behind his practical work was the

outlook of a mystic. Always he was conscious of the world hidden by appearances and to him the most important fact in life was human personality expressed in meditation and thought. "All our thoughts," he declared, "are throngs of living souls." He studied the *Bhagavad Gita* and other treasures of Eastern poetry and philosophy. He brought a receptive spirit to this study and soon, in poems and in paintings, he was expressing shadowy images of the grandeur of life. A key-note is expressed in the verse where he writes of how "the herdsman, beneath his rustic habit, finds himself a king." The kingliness of common humanity—this was his essential teaching. Such a conception of democracy elevates each man and does not degrade him as the product of a mass mould. This teaching is a corrective to every system which would treat man merely as an instrument of production or a weapon for winning wars.

Æ was early attracted to the Theosophical movement and was one of a group of young men in Dublin—including W. B. Yeats—who were influenced by the teachings of Madame Blavatsky. Later still Æ took a leading part in forming the Hermetic Society, an offshoot from the parent body, and for many years he devoted his time and energy to advocacy of these ideas. Behind all his work as an artist, a poet, an economist and a literary man was a conception of God and man and nature as one single and yet multitudinous being. This gave his work and ideas a complete harmony although they reached out in varied directions.

As a young man Æ was a clerk in a Dublin commercial office, working long hours for meagre pay. "When one works nearly twelve hours a day, hard work," he remarks, "there is not much spirit left for other things."

What was worst to me in this overwork was what happens now and then in the hot room, the sudden flashes of recollection or looking out for a moment at the sunlight over the houses, golden white, the blue ether, the distance, the haze; then it all comes over me, the sense of something missed.

He wrote a foreword to a little book of mine dealing with modern industry and reverted to the memory of those early days :—

When I was a boy I knew for myself how a great business organisation can draw the soul into itself and dull it to its own inhuman image. I revolted and ran away to fight, in poetry and painting, the mechanism by which I had been confined. But every now and then, as in a nightmare, I would remember the past, the fierce inhuman activity of body and mind, the exhaustion of energy when the day's work was over.

Æ was a very gentle and courteous man and yet he could explode into passionate indignation when he saw injustice. During his early years he deeply resented the attitude of an overbearing superintendent at the office and confided to a friend that "sometimes I think I will blaze out at that man and scorch him up."

This experience, it has been suggested, was the beginning of his sympathy for all those who endured oppression. But indeed no basis of personal experience was necessary for him. With his high ideal of humanity he considered that oppressive acts injured both those who suffered and those who committed them.

His own material wants were few. About a year before his death he wrote to a friend in America :—

We are all poor in Ireland and it has done none of us any harm. The happiest years of my life were when I was young and lived on less than fifty pounds a year and could afford no luxuries. But we sat up to all hours talking about everything in heaven and earth and we brooded and brooded on what we read. I live now very economically as my fixed income is about £100 a year. And am I unhappy? Good God, no....So many artists want a motor car, a house, to give parties, etc., that they sell their genius for cash....For about six years I lived on an income varying from thirty to sixty pounds a year and was magnificently happy. Yeats had long years of poverty and never sold his talent. Stephens was living on £1 a week when he wrote *The Charwoman's Daughter* and *The Crock of Gold.* Stephen McKenna, the translator of Plotinus, the greatest piece of prose written in our time, I think, lived at the end of his life in a cottage on £2 a week rather than undertake work he did not like....

It will be seen that Æ always put the claims of personality first. A man must follow out the lines of his gift or his destiny. He must develop his potentialities and do his work in and for the world. Circumstance must bend before the will of a resolute man.

Winged spirits in human form embody the splendour of his visions, their white limbs and luminous wings speaking of a traffic between earth and heaven as surely as the ladder which William Blake hung between heaven and Charing Cross. Into his poems Æ infuses some of the delicate colour of his paintings. *Homeward : Songs by the Way*, which appeared in 1894, was his first book and it contains poems glowing with colour :—

Faint grew the yellow buds of light
Far flickering beyond the snows
As leaning o'er the shadowy white
Morn glimmered like the pale primrose.

The Great Breath begins :—

Its edges foamed with amethyst and rose
Withers once more the old blue flame of day.
There where the ether like the diamond glows
Its petals fade away.

In his poems and paintings Æ seems to merge into an exciting universe full of colour and sensation upon which he can draw at will. Writing for an obscure journal he once signed an article "Æon." But the printer could not decipher the word and it came back as "Æ—?" Russell struck off the query from the proof and retained his characteristic signature. In his early exuberant days he sometimes felt

the need for more direct expression than he could get through pen or paint-brush. So one Sunday morning he mounted the sea-wall at Bray and began to talk to the people about the ancient gods of Ireland and their heroic qualities. Among his listeners was Standish O'Grady who was later to write many heroic romances based on old legends.

Æ's lifelong service to the cause of rural co-operation in Ireland began in curious fashion. W. B. Yeats—who had been a school-fellow in Dublin—suggested to Sir Horace Plunkett that Æ might be made an organiser for the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society. So he began his pilgrimage, often by bicycle or on foot, over the Irish mountains to the villages, where he talked of the advantages of co-operation and gave advice on loans, about seed and every other practical detail. Following this he was asked to undertake the editorship of *The Irish Homestead*, the weekly organ of the movement, and succeeded in making this a journal famous for its literary qualities as well as for the cause it served.

Soon came the turbulent years of Irish Labour unrest culminating in a great lockout involving all the unskilled workers of the city. Hunger entered the gaunt tenement dwellings and for months the associated employers remained obdurate in their demand that the men must leave their union before they could return to work. Æ was not personally involved in this conflict. He could easily have stood on one side. Instead he penned a scorching "Open Letter to the Masters of Dublin," lashing them for their lack of humanity and prophesying that, even if they had their way, they would leave such a smouldering feeling of hatred behind that in a few years the people of the city would rise up, wreaking destruction and violence all round. Three years later the Easter Rising occurred and the Citizen Army—formed by the strikers and led by James Connolly—was the fuse which fired this explosion.

Not content with the written word, Æ crossed to London and in the Albert Hall spoke to a vast audience in blistering terms of those who in their stiff-necked pride were willing to condemn children to starvation. He arrived back in Dublin to face a furious campaign launched by united reactionaries who accused him of misusing his position in the co-operative moment to intervene in the Labour struggle. Æ answered his critics in the London *Times*. He wrote :—

I am charged with being a revolutionary: I, who for seven or eight years past have week by week been expounding an orderly evolution of society. I am charged with being against religion : I, the sole poet of my generation who has never written a single poem which did not try to express a spiritual mood.

The opposition, which wanted to remove him from the *Homestead* editorial office, crumbled away.

Not only did he serve progressive

and humanitarian ends in the great Labour struggle but he was one of the pioneers with Yeats in the literary Renaissance in Ireland, known as the Celtic Twilight because of its mist-laden beauty. Æ also took a leading part in the work of the Irish dramatic movement associated with the Abbey Theatre. He wrote a play *Deirdre* in which he made an impressive appearance on the stage as a druid. Increasingly he won recognition as a leader and a teacher on the spiritual plane while, in practical affairs, the interlacing system of co-operative dairies which grew up in the country owed much to his untiring efforts. What the poet and the mystic gained from the farmers in deepening the practical side of his nature cannot be estimated.

My first meeting with Æ was in his lofty editorial tower at the top of The Plunkett House in Dublin. The walls were covered with brown-tinted paper from which gleamed shining life-sized figures wrought out of his imagination. His burly genial figure, smiling mouth and eager friendly eyes made him a personality not easily forgotten. And when he spoke he combined wisdom with poetic charm. For several years I called at the *Irish Statesman* office every week to discuss articles and reviews for the journal and never did I fail to be delighted at the breadth of mind, the generosity of spirit and the warm friendliness which shone through his conversation. At that time he seemed an essential part of Dublin, striding along in his great cloak through the city streets.

In *The National Being*—one of his best-known books—he speaks of the Irish peasant as possessing a "culture which lingers like a fragrance about his mind, sharing in the loveliest nation, the skies over him ever cloudy like an opal, the mountains flowing across the horizon in wave on wave of amethyst and pearl." He believed that the spirit of the people was best expressed in co-operative activity and was sanguine about the possibilities of linking co-operative industry with co-operative agriculture in a way that would allow for the greatest individual freedom. He had a horror of domination by big business organisations or by the ruthless State, both of which, he thought, cared nothing for the life and happiness of the individual.

When *The Irish Statesman* ceased publication Æ turned to America. His felicitous command of words and ideas assured him of eager hearers, while his insistence on the needs of the human being in spite of the claims of social organisation, everywhere found response. When he left Ireland—although he had the deepest love of the country—he did not mourn his exile. Instead he wrote :–

> I am rejoicing at present in being a wanderer, the cries of my race no longer touching me, the lights of love and home long behind me and drowned in hazes of sunken years. I like the sensation of freedom, that none puts a delaying hand on me, and I can, like

the Indians, retire to the jungle to meditate.

Meditation, the sensation of freedom, the claims of personality in an organised world—these were the ideas which Æ lived to express, they formed the basis of his belief in spiritual democracy. To the Irish people and to the people of the world he spoke on behalf of the men of his type :—

No blazoned banner we unfold—
One charge alone we give to youth,
Against the sceptred myth to hold
The golden heresy of truth.

R. M. Fox

EDUCATING FUTURE MOTHERS

Addressing a large gathering of the Mahila Seva Samaja at Bangalore on 8th December, Sir M. Visvesvaraya is reported by *The Hindu* to have said :—

> One advanced view is that in the first seven years of life, the child should be shown the way to become aware of the world ; in the second seven years, the development of her moral nature should be helped by elementary education ; in the third seven years, the intellect should be developed and also her sense of discipline and responsibility. This brings up the period of training to 21 years. In the fourth seven-year period, vocational training is recommended, without which the education of women is not considered complete. To make it of value to Indian women, it has to be adapted and adjusted to the realities of life in this country."

Because of the great influence of women in the home, the education of the mothers of future India is of paramount importance. Those who complain of the unsuitable character of the education which Indian girls get, and those who are thinking of schemes of reconstructing women's education will find much of value in these few suggestions.

The life of man does fall in seven-year cycles. The educationist who recognises that division is in so far prepared to help Nature and work on with her, but the educational divisions cannot, naturally, be hard and fast. Discipline must begin in the cradle and moral education is never finished, as Sir Visvesvaraya may well have brought out in elaborating his thesis. One aspect, particularly, which should not be lost sight of in educational planning is the pupils' need, especially in adolescence, for noble patterns upon which to mould themselves.

A purely literary education, exalting memory at the expense of independent thinking, too often unfits our youngsters for practical work. Further, the divorce from reality which emphasis on specialisation necessarily creates, frustrates the very purpose of education. That purpose is all-round development, including the unfoldment of the inner faculties and powers. Sir M. Visvesvaraya's suggestions envisage such all-round development—both physical and mental. Only such an education and development can produce really efficient men and women adjusted to their environment, alive to their social responsibilities and prepared to fulfil them.

SRI AUROBINDO, THE PROPHET OF THE SUPERMAN

[**Dr. S. K. Maitra** of the Benares Hindu University is a devoted student of Sri Aurobindo's philosophy. His *Introduction to the Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo* was reviewed in THE ARYAN PATH for August 1942. The teaching of the Superman in its fundamentals is as old as Indian philosophy, as old, in fact, as thinking man. But not even Supermen—our race has produced many—can redeem a single individual against his will or without his own earnest effort. And *Natura non fecit saltum*.—ED.]

When I received a request from the Editor of this magazine to write some article for it, I felt that no subject would be more appropriate than one dealing with some aspect of the message of Sri Aurobindo, for the seventieth birthday of that great sage and philosopher would fall on the 15th of this month (August). And of all aspects of his message, that which makes the greatest appeal to us today is his prophecy of the Superman.

The honour of being the first to use the word Superman, though not of being the first to introduce the idea connoted by the term—for the idea of a race of higher beings is present in the literature of all countries and all ages, and is perhaps as old as mankind itself—undoubtedly belongs to Nietzsche. "Man," declared Nietzsche, "is something that must be overcome." "What is great in man," he said, "is that he is a bridge and no end." Through the mouth of his favourite sage Zarathustra he further announced, "I love those who do not seek in the stars the reason of going down and offering themselves for sacrifice, but who offer themselves to the earth, in order that the earth may belong to the superman....I love him who works and feels, in order that he may prepare the house for the superman and keep the earth, beast and plant ready for him; for thus he desires his own downfall."

But if Nietzsche must be given credit for being the first to introduce the word Superman, he must also be held responsible for lowering the idea of the Superman and reducing it to that of an Asuric or Titanic man. The new race pictured by him might be stronger and more powerful, but it was certainly not *better* than the existing race of men. In fact, if anything, it was more ruthless and cruel. This appears clearly from the list which he gave of the qualities of the Superman. In the morality of the Superman, which he called master-morality, the virtues which figured were courage, the power to conquer and to rule, but the qualities which we value most, such as sympathy and benevolence,

were expressly excluded from the list as not worthy of being ascribed to the race of Superman.

Sri Aurobindo's Superman is the God-man, the Gnostic Being, who excels man not in physical strength or in the power to rule and to conquer, but in things of the spirit. There is, however, this in common between Sri Aurobindo and Nietzsche, that they both emphasize that if the world is really to be raised to a higher level, it can be done only by a new and higher race of men and not through individual salvation. The path of individual salvation was favoured by our ancient sages. There can be no doubt that this path, with the appropriate sādhanā, followed by a large number of people for centuries, created a spiritual atmosphere very favourable to the growth of a higher consciousness in the race. But Sri Aurobindo believes that this is not enough, as it cannot lead to a total transformation of nature, a radical change in the universe, which is the goal of evolution.

To return now to Sri Aurobindo's conception of the Superman.

The emergence of the Superman is a necessity of evolution. Evolution or Ascent is the return of the Spirit to itself, as Involution or Descent is the self-projection of the Spirit. At every step the latter conditions the former. To the extent to which the Spirit has descended into the world, to that extent it can evolve. As the Spirit has descended into Matter, therefore Matter can evolve into Life. So is it with the evolution of Life and Mind. Evolution must reproduce in the reverse order the process of the involution of the Spirit. The process of evolution cannot stop until the Spirit has returned to itself out of its involution in the world. So far, this process has produced four principles; Matter, Life, Soul and Mind. The time is bound to come, sooner or later, when the next higher principle, the Supermind, will emerge.

Consequently also, the emergence of the Superman is an evolutionary necessity, for the Superman is the Being into whom the Supermind has descended, the Gnostic Being with the supramental consciousness. The descent of the Supermind, however, will cause the emergence of, not an individual Superman, but a race of Supermen. And along with the emergence of a race of Supermen there will be produced also a radical change in the whole nature of the universe, physical, vital, psychical and mental. In fact, the Superman cannot appear until matter, life, soul and mind undergo a radical transformation. This follows from one of the main principles of Sri Aurobindo's theory of evolution. Evolution to a higher stage does not mean the annulment of the previous stages, but their transformation. When mind emerges in the course of evolution, the lower principles, matter, life, soul, undergo a transformation, with the result that after the emergence of mind these principles become different from

what they were before. The new principle, when it emerges, descends into the lower ones and is integrated with them, so that they also get the benefit of the light that comes from it, and their nature undergoes a change. This is what Sri Aurobindo calls integration.

But the cosmic necessity for the emergence of the Superman does not prove its emergence in the human being, for it might very well happen that the higher consciousness might descend into some other being. To show the necessity of its emergence in human consciousness we have therefore to examine carefully the human consciousness itself for the purpose of ascertaining whether in that consciousness there are signs which unmistakably point to a higher destiny for man. If we do so, we come across the phenomenon of human aspiration which undoubtedly points in this direction.

This aspiration is to lead a Divine Life in this terrestrial existence. But, apart from this definite aspiration, what has distinguished man from the very beginning of his career is a spiritual urge, an impulse towards self-exceeding. This, in Sri Aurobindo's view, gives man the right to receive the higher consciousness when it descends into the world. The nature of man will, of course, be transformed when this great event, for which the whole world is eagerly waiting, takes place. But he will not be pushed to the wall, he will not perish, in order to make room for a higher race. What will happen is only a radical change in the nature of man, raising him to the status of a Divine Man. A Divine Man! Yes, that is the destiny of man—to end not as man but as a higher race of beings. This new race of Divine Men or Gnostic Beings will be the consummation and fulfilment of all that exists already in man as an aspiration.

It is very important to remember that this doctrine of the Superman is very different from humanism. Humanism looks upon man and his problems as the sole concern of philosophy. It judges everything from the standpoint of man as he is at present, with his social, economic, political, religious and other needs. It does not take into account at all the subhuman or the superhuman world. This is, to say the least of it, a grossly inadequate view. Man and his problems are only a passing phase in evolution. They cannot be allowed to loom so large as to put into the shade all other problems. Indeed, to look upon them as the sole or even the chief concern of philosophy is to lose all sense of proportion. Sri Aurobindo's impatience, therefore, with those who want to look at the universe from the point of view of humanism is fully justified.

The standpoint of the philosophy of the Superman is very different from this. It takes into account the whole universe and not the small part of it which is concerned with man and his needs. It only asserts that man has shown his capacity to

become something higher than man, and that consequently, when the Higher Light will descend which will transform the whole universe into something much grander, nobler and purer than what it is at present, it will descend into his consciousness. The result of this descent will be to change man into the Superman, but it will equally change Nature into Supernature (*Parā Prakriti*). It is from the standpoint of this Superman with his Supernature that Sri Aurobindo tries to look at the universe, but this standpoint is one for which human needs and human problems have lost their special significance and have become merged in the larger issues which now come into view.

The Superman is not the same as an Avatara. The Avatara takes birth in this world for a special purpose. His work over, he withdraws from the world and leaves it to its slow process of evolution. He does not effect any radical change in the nature of the universe; he only removes some stumbling-block which impedes the process of evolution and lets it proceed on its slow onward march. It is true he takes birth in a human body, but by that he does not divinize the whole race of man. His advent only proves that the human body is a sufficiently noble vessel to contain the Divine Essence; it gives an ocular demonstration that man has the capacity of becoming Divine. Or, in the words of Sri Aurobindo, "the Avatar comes as the manifestation of the divine nature in the human nature, the apocalypse of its Christhood, Krishnahood, Buddhahood, in order that the human nature may, by moulding its principle, thought, feeling, act, being, on the lines of that Christhood, Krishnahood, Buddhahood, transfigure itself into the Divine."[1]

The Superman, however, is not a temporary denizen of the world, like the Avatara. He does not come into it with a special mission and leave it as soon as that is over. He comes to stay permanently in the world and raises the whole tone of the universe by doing so. He does not come merely as an individual but as a member of a higher race of beings. The process of evolution does not stop with his emergence. It only undergoes a radical change, for before his emergence it was through ignorance and after his emergence it becomes for the first time an evolution through knowledge and it must continue till it attains its goal, which is the emergence of the Sachchidananda. We must not forget that above the Supermind, the emergence of which will cause the advent of the Superman, there is the still higher principle of the Sachchidananda, or the triune principle of the Pure Existent, Consciousness-Force and Bliss.

Such, in brief outline, is Sri Aurobindo's conception of the Superman. It may, however, be said that by making the emergence of the

[1] *Essays on the Gita*, First Series, p. 215.

Superman dependent upon a radical change in man's nature, it removes it to an extremely distant future. The apprehension, however, is groundless. For, says Sri Aurobindo,

> what is demanded by this change is not something altogether distant, alien to our existence and radically impossible, for what has to be developed is there in our being and not something outside it....What is necessary is that there should be a turn in humanity felt by some or many towards the vision of this change, a feeling of its imperative need, the sense of its possibility, the will to make it possible in themselves and to find the way. That trend is not absent and it must increase with the tension of the crisis in human world-destiny; the need of an escape or a solution, the feeling that there is no other solution than the spiritual cannot but grow and become more imperative under the urgency of critical circumstance. To that call in the Being there must always be some answer in the Divine Reality and in Nature.[1]

S. K. MAITRA

A GLOBAL ORDER

The statement which Bertrand and Patricia Russell recently made on India, conceals behind apparent anxiety to solve the Indian deadlock, a conservative unwillingness for Britain to let go her hold immediately. Mr. Russell is enough of a freethinker to believe that "no nation should be the subject of another nation." But the Russells would limit the sovereignty of all.

> Each nation should be subject in some respects to all others. This would imply extension of the principle of democratic government to international affairs.

They concede that "India has the same right of independence as any other country in the modern world." But the plan they propose for doling out freedom in instalments does not show the same international breadth of outlook. It betrays on the contrary a hyper-consciousness of arrogated responsibilities, more than a hint of condescension and a pathetic faith in endless negotiations and conferences. The long-run solution, the holding out of boons for post-war bestowal, lends scant assurance to doubters of the United Nations' protestations.

In his convocation address at the Travancore University Sir C. R. Reddy expressed the conviction that the whole trend of events was towards "a supreme Global Order."

Many thinkers have been advocating an "equalitarian co-operative world order." But Sir C. R. Reddy's conviction that "after all, the conception of humanity is nobler than that of race, than that of nations and States" is really valuable. He was perfectly right when he said that the present war would only result in a "global *status quo* and stalemate" if Mr. Churchill said that

> everything that England gained in China and Asia in the days of their weakness shall be regarded as our eternal and natural properties."

---

[1] *The Life Divine*, Vol. II, Part II, pp. 1169-70.

CONSCIENCE AND INTUITION
A REVALUATION

[The **Rev. Leslie Belton,** broad-minded Unitarian Minister and former Editor of *The Inquirer,* distinguishes here between that which passes for conscience but is only a system of acquired reflexes, the voice of convention or even of rationalised desire, and the "still small voice," which when it clearly speaks is louder than the thunder's roll. Mr. Belton has done well to differentiate between inhibitions artificially imposed and what he calls "the *true* principle of conscience....spiritual intuition, the Divine Light in the innermost man." But does not introspection reveal something between the two, something that, like the lighthouse, warns against a dangerous course but cannot indicate unerringly the way to go? A discussion of conscience is hardly complete if it fails to take account of this voice of accumulated individual experience in this or previous lives, a voice, moreover, which one flouts at one's peril. Shall we say that there are two Voices of Conscience, besides the voice of habits, inhibitions, etc., which masquerades as Conscience? These two are:—(1) The voice of the accumulated experiences of the past, including those of previous lives, which the incarnated ego carries; the voice which admonishes, warns, etc., but which is not able to guide and direct that ego and to which the name of human conscience may be given. (2) Divine Conscience, the voice of intuition, when the personal consciousness is lighted up by Buddhi, spiritual intuition.—ED.]

Few words in the English language are so gravely misused as the word, conscience. That the word represents a genuine experience of human nature is beyond dispute but whether it can safely carry the weighty canvas that is hoisted upon it is a matter for doubt.

It is sometimes assumed that modern analytical psychology was first in the field in rebutting the more extravagant notions of conscience current in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Yet Montaigne anticipates the psychologist's viewpoint when in one of his Essays he affirms that "the laws of conscience, which we pretend are born of nature, are born of custom," a dictum wholly discordant with Byron's lines,

> Whatever creed be taught or land be trod
> Man's conscience is the oracle of God,

or Browning's apostrophising of conscience as "The great beacon light God sets in all."

Of these antithetical views that which affirms the divinity or sanctity of conscience is the more traditional, and until recently has been the more commonly held. From early times men have recognised an inward voice approving and disapproving their motives and acts, constraining to good deeds and restraining from bad. This experience is as ancient as man's awareness of good and evil, a perdurable concomitant of his achievement of self-conscious estate. Exalted over animal creation, man became a conscience-struck soul.

But only in modern times have thinkers raised a temple in honour of conscience in the shape of a moral philosophy. We think of Kant's moral imperative, recalling his reflection upon " the starry heavens above and the moral law within "; of Bishop Butler's doctrine concerning a ruling faculty of conscience magisterially presiding over the attributes and passions of man, and of James Martineau's ethical intuitionism claiming conscience as a divine revelation " consentaneous for all men. "

Butler and Martineau both insist on the supremacy of conscience. For Butler conscience is an absolute authority in virtue of which man has a natural propulsion towards social happiness. There is reason to believe, he says, that the Author of our nature intended it for this purpose. What is singular in Butler's treatment of this matter in his celebrated Sermons is his equation of conscience with reflection. Man as a moral agent has the capacity to reflect upon his experience and thereby to reach indubitable judgments of right and wrong.

This teaching, especially as Martineau shapes it, represents the working out in terms of ethics of the mystical tradition. It gives to the doctrine of immediacy an ethical content linking the moral imperative that is within the man to a source beyond man whence its authority derives. Hence its authority is absolute, for denial of it is denial of God himself.

As soon, however, as we come to reflect on this high claim we become aware of certain psychological difficulties. Is it a sound and a rational assumption that men are endowed with a faculty which enables them unerringly to distinguish which actions are right and which are wrong in every given situation? Is conscience an inborn faculty sovereign by divine right over the constitution of man? Observation and experience seem emphatically to disprove this assumption, for the voice of conscience speaks in diverse tones and reflection is by no means the faultless monitor Butler assumes it to be. Thus to claim sacrosanctity for conscience (or for what passes for conscience) is to overlook certain psychological facts which we must briefly note.

Conscience may be described psychologically as an impulsive trend of the total psyche, manifesting itself emotionally and volitionally, towards an acceptable end. How it manifests depends upon the formative influences which have been brought to bear on the psyche itself. Conscience is made, not born. Thus there is no such thing as conscience pure and simple, the same in all men. It is a product of environment combined with training and temperament, of inheritance combining with experience. Conscience may therefore be regarded as primarily the product of the parental or any other authority to which the child was subject in early years. The child, outgrowing this authority, may cease to give it

his conscious assent, but it nevertheless persists as a subconscious influence determining his attitude, constraining him to this, restraining him from that, long after the years of nonage are passed. Environment—especially the home life of the child's earliest years—is of considerable importance in the formation of conscience, though later years may modify this influence as the personality becomes subject to counter-influence in the larger world.

Although conscience is an inward guide it is questionable whether its guidance is invariably rational or wholesome; sometimes it gives us a feeling of guilt about trivial things which the rational judgment informs us cannot be sinful. An example may be found in Edmund Gosse's *Father and Son* where he tells of how his mother, who had rich imaginative and inventive gifts, always thought of story-telling as a sinful occupation. No work of fiction of any kind, religious or secular, was admitted into her house. The cause of this strange antipathy lay in the influence upon her child-mind of a Christian Calvinistic governess who had taught her that fiction was wicked, a lesson she had learned all too well and, consciously or subconsciously, never forgot. Thus can conscience be malformed.

The conclusion seems obvious: conscience has to be purified, disciplined and trained to meet the conditions and demands of mature adult life. To achieve freedom from the conditioning of childhood we must learn that a conscience worth having is a conscience that is disciplined by reason and liberated from the bias of the nursery-mind. One of our troubles is that so many people still carry the nursery-mind into adult life. The wise man continually educates and refines his conscience so that conscience keeps pace with the expanding horizons of manhood. Conscience, rightly conceived, is a thong, not a creed, a spur to self-responsible and rational moral action. A conscience worth living with is a conscience one has made for oneself.

It follows from what has been said or implied that from this point of view there can be no universal conscience, the same for everybody, determining with absolute certainty some actions to be good and others to be evil in all circumstances and on all occasions. The moral law is a law in no legal sense requiring obedience to a specific code with penalties for its infringement; it is better described as man's will-to-good. So described it implies universal acceptance of a moral principle capable of lifting the personality out of his egocentredness and ego-aggressiveness and obliging him to conform to certain standards of behaviour conducive to social cohesion.

The universality of this will-to-good seems a justifiable assumption, but the will-to-good does not always and everywhere express itself in the same way. How it expresses itself depends not alone, perhaps not primarily, upon personal idiosyncrasies but upon the cultural pattern to

which a person belongs and the traditions he accepts. For religion's sake the Aztecs immolated living human beings. Yet the religions of the higher culture learned to dispense with even the token sacrifices of a pigeon or a lamb. A defeated Japanese military commander who failed to commit hara-kiri would probably be conscience-plagued for the rest of his life. Yet in Christian lands suicide is in any circumstances a sin. Customs and conventions, and hence conscience, vary from people to people. What is morally admirable or morally pardonable in one cultural pattern may be reprehensible in another. Even within the cultural pattern itself—in England at the present time—conscience prompts some men to resist military enlistment while others (among the numberless ones who accept the inevitable without serious thought) actively seek enlistment for conscience sake. Moreover, conscience can be warped, inverted, turned against itself, as the history of fanaticism abundantly shows. Torquemada would have slept uneasily in his bed had he not been the conscientious Inquisitor he was. The ardent nihilist who wrecks a train, and the homicide who assassinates a king, can justify their destructive propensities on the principle that the end justifies the means if the end be a social order nearer their heart's desire.

We may conclude then that though the *fact* of conscience may be universal its *form* is various. The form it assumes, its direction and moral purity, depends upon its conditioning—the influences which have gone to its making, the cultural background, the traditions and *mores* of the group, the training of childhood in early years. If conscience be the Voice of God it is a voice that speaks many languages, the purest and the most uncouth.

So far our enquiry has led us unmistakably towards a negative judgment on the high claims for conscience advanced by ethical thinkers like Butler and Martineau. Conscience, as we have discerned and described it, is the voice of the ego expressing itself in terms of conventional morals. Is this the last word? Or can we truthfully find room within the human complex for the wayward and fallible conscience as psychology perceives it, and also for the indefectible moral intuition of the mystic's claim? Can we reconcile the facts of common-sense observation with the assertion that conscience is the seal of the divine in the inward man?

Reconciliation seems impossible so long as the one word, conscience, is used to describe disparate psychic states. That it is so used is the source of much ambiguity. The same word is employed to denote both the propulsive ego-urge towards a moral (amoral or immoral) end, and the spiritual element in man, the Overself. Edmond Holmes, for example, speaks of the voice of the higher self as the voice of conscience; it is, he says "the claim

put forward by the spiritual side of one's being—the claim to be the true self, a claim...which is again and again dishonoured and rejected, yet never relaxes its hold upon us." (*The Secret of Happiness*) Whether Holmes's use of the word, conscience, to describe the intimations of the higher self unwittingly confuses the issue, since the term has other all-too-familiar associations which are assuredly not those he wishes to convey? Conscience may be the voice of the "lower" self masquerading as the voice of the "higher" self. Ought we then to retain the word as descriptive of moral intuition? How can we distinguish between the "conditioned" conscience and conscience conceived as intuitive knowledge charged with a sense of obligation?

A possible answer to this question is suggested by Mr. J. D. Beresford in his book *What I Believe*. There is, he assumes, a true inner direction arising from the principle of conscience although "what we call our conscience may prompt us to actions that another would condemn." Why is this? Mr. Beresford meets the difficulty by distinguishing between a primary and a secondary conscience, the natural and the artificial voice. The former is the genuine "still small voice." The latter is a compound of the mental and moral habits formed by our subscription to social and religious codes.

From our earliest years, we begin to build up a secondary conscience that is no more trustworthy than any of the general rules of morality on which it is founded. To say that the doing of this or that is "against our conscience" means nine times out of ten that it is against the principle that we have more or less deliberately adopted as just and right.

The word "deliberately" here suggests that the personality has control over the growth of the conscience-complex whereas the process of conscience formation seems to be largely unconscious and undeliberate, not the result of conscious choice. This, however, is a comparatively minor point. What is meant is clear enough, and highly suggestive. The secondary conscience is the seat not of eternal values but of prejudice, scrupulosity and personal promptings deriving from the body-mind; its morality is of the automatic kind; press the button and you get the answer, the same button always inducing the same response. The primary conscience, on the other hand, is spiritual and hence spontaneous, genuinely intuitional and authoritative.

It follows, then, that what we customarily call conscience is a temporal complex of impulses formed in childhood and sometimes, though not invariably, modified by experience. The *true* principle of conscience—the inner mystery of our manhood—is the source of inspiration and authentic guidance commanding in the rare moments of its deliverance the concordant assent of our whole being. It is spiritual intuition, the Divine Light in the innermost man.

Though for convenience sake we may allow Mr. Beresford's distinction between a primary and a secondary conscience, the one "heavenly" and the other "earthly," the one inborn and the other conditioned, there is need for caution lest we fall into the error of fragmentising the psychic whole into independent faculties or parts. The human being, it is true, is many "selves," but the ideal man, perfectly integrated, is one Self. "Man partly is and wholly hopes to be," said Browning. It is the Self man *wholly* hopes to be, the Self within his selves, which is the source and seat of genuine intuition, the "inner light," the Voice of God.

LESLIE BELTON

"NO LONGER A FIGHT FOR FREEDOM"

At a meeting of Nobel Prize Winners in New York Mrs. Pearl S. Buck declared that this war was no longer a fight for freedom but one to save the European civilization.

If somewhere this year there could have been a man great enough to have declared that this war was a war for freedom of all peoples, we would not have had to face, as we do face, another war, of which this is only the beginning.

The complacent illusion has persisted somehow in the West—with some notable exceptions—that all would be well if some kind of peace were to be established in Europe. With Europe at rest, nothing very much would need to be done outside. But it is this "outside" which is the thorn in Europe's side, and which has given this war universal significance. Europe has become the pit for the combatants only because powerful nations with colonial possessions and world-wide commercial entanglements, are herded together there.

If this is a war between the real upholders of democracy against the dictatorships, then those who uphold freedom and democracy should not themselves be guilty of injustice, against which they say they are fighting. The unwillingness to admit even in principle the right of all exploited nations to justice and fair-play, exposes the pretensions of the avowed guardians of the democratic way of life. If it is a war for freedom, then it must be freedom for all. There can be no lasting peace without justice for all. Mrs. Pearl S. Buck has had the courage to express what most fear to face and to say.

Self-complacence and false illusions only obscure the truth that a patched-up peace in Europe is no final solution of the problems which the war has created or of those out of which the war itself sprang. Whether rooted in assumed racial superiority or in the hope that it is still possible to maintain the *status quo*, the unwillingness to let the subject nations go is obvious. But until assurance is given these peoples and the hope of freedom inspired in them, neither can protestations ring true nor future wars be avoided.

A CRITIQUE OF HINDUISM

[Love of and loyalty to religion are so natural to the heart of the Indian that in this country the very colour of his patriotism is tarnished by his creedalism. In most Western lands religious feeling is not allowed to sway political programmes, mainly because secularism dominates the life of the people. In the following article **Shri U. C. Bhattacharjee,** an experienced educationist, writes about the work before Indians of all faiths who should labour for a higher synthesis which would bind the various groups into a single nation.—ED.]

Whatever Hinduism be taken to mean—a way of life, a philosophy of the world or a religion—there is no doubt that above everything else it is an incorporated system of beliefs. But the very extent of the area in which it is accepted and the range of time through which it has lived down to the present, have endowed it with characteristics which admit of different interpretations. Even within its fold men do not always see eye to eye regarding its true nature. The claim of the orthodox that Hinduism, being an embodiment of eternal truths has not been changed and can never be changed need not detain us. We can easily show that this belief cannot be true of any sectarian body of knowledge. Eternal truth cannot but be universal and impersonal.

Religion, however, is hard to change. Attempts at reform very often lead to the birth of new religions. Instead of accepting reform, the more orthodox expel the reformer from the fold and brand him and his followers as heretics, and the reformed religion soon becomes a new religion. Buddhism is an instance. It was but a reform of Hinduism. Buddha was a Hindu just as Jesus was a Jew whose reform led to the establishment of Christianity. To start with, Buddhism was a protestant movement within Hinduism. Buddha opposed certain empty formalities of religion and wanted to turn men's minds to deeper spiritual perceptions. But the irony of fate was that he was too lofty for his time. Many no doubt accepted him; but organised orthodoxy stubbornly resisted him. The result was a struggle which lasted for centuries. There were conquests and reconquests on both sides. Buddhism was branded as a new faith, hostile to the old religion of the *Vedas*. But gradually Buddha was admitted into the Hindu pantheon and regarded as one of the incarnations of the Deity. Some of the principles for which he fought were incorporated into Hinduism. It was a partial triumph for Buddhism and a partial reform of Hinduism. Hinduism could not lapse again completely into its pre-Buddhistic form. Old deities, old modes of worship and old morality yielded

place to new. *Ahimsa* or non-injury to life was accepted as a higher morality than the religion of sacrifice could provide.

The work of Buddha, the Reformer, coupled with that of Mahavir, the last of the Jain Tirthankaras, gave Hinduism a shaking and pre-Buddhistic Hinduism seems to have been in danger of being ruled out of existence altogether, when a new spirit of revivalism was born. Political power was behind this movement. Hindu kings who overthrew Buddhist kingdoms naturally allied themselves with Hindu orthodoxy and brought the resources of Hinduism together and helped in the resuscitation of ancient Vedic rites and beliefs.

But conditions of life continued to change and the spirit of reform once roused could not be completely suppressed. Among the most important socio-political changes that took place in the middle ages and affected the status of Hinduism were the rise of the Rajputs and the coming of the Muslims.

The traditional answer of Hinduism to successive invasions had always been to absorb the invaders with some attendant reform and reshaping of Hindu Society. That succeeded with the Rajputs. But the assimilation of the Muslims was a tough business and has obviously failed. The Muslims came with a codified religion—a definite system of beliefs, to which they clung with all the enthusiasm of new converts. They were determined not to part with any article of their faith or to allow any modification of it. Moreover, Hinduism appears to have lost much of its old vigour and power of assimilation and to have been unable to appropriate new elements. The result was a more or less unabated conflict of two apparently heterogeneous cultures. This conflict has not ceased, but attempts to solve it have been made more than once during the past millennium.

Liberal-minded Muslims in high places as well as low—men like the Emperor Akbar and the weaver Kabir—tried to bring the two cultures together. Among the Hindus also, many reformers arose: master minds who fully realised that the presence of Islam in the land meant a new situation; and that, in order to survive, Hinduism must adapt itself. A fusion of the conflicting forces, more or less complete, was the ideal for which these great men strove. Nanak, Chaitanya and several others symbolise this new consciousness. Any one who looks at the movements ushered in by these men in their historical perspective—any one who tries to understand these movements with a mind free from the influence of orthodoxy which subsequently overshadowed them—will see in them the embodiment of the spirit of reform and of adaptation. Were caste and polytheism an impediment to the coming together of Hinduism and Islam? Sikhism denied them. Did untouchability and elaborate ritualism stand between the Hindus and the Mussal-

mans? Chaitanya denounced them. Later, however, these tendencies culminated in several independent sects either within or without Hinduism. This meant the temporary triumph of orthodoxy against the forces of liberalism.

But the spirit of reform, the desire to adapt and the revolt against senile orthodoxy could not be killed at a stroke. This spirit has again and again raised its head against the forces of conservatism. It fights against odds but does not give up.

Dayananda's Arya Samaj is a case of revivalism in so far as it professes to go back to the *Vedas*, but it is pre-eminently a reform movement in so far as it denies the correctness of earlier interpretations of the *Vedas* and reads new meaning into them. Caste and polytheism were supposed to agree with the Vedic teachings as once understood; the Arya Samajists reject them.

Brahmoism is another great reform movement which arose out of the double impact of Christianity and Islam on Hinduism. For a long time the Brahmos have been regarded as an un-Hindu sect. Various causes have contributed to this. But the history of Brahmoism indicates that neither Devendranath nor Rammohan nor Keshabchandra intended anything more than a reform; a breach with Hinduism took place only when it became inevitable. Towards the beginning, Brahmoism was content with a minimum of rejection of old tenets, *viz.*, idolatry. Gradually, from the time of Keshab onwards, partly owing to the continued hostility of orthodox Hinduism and partly because of the increasing needs of the time, Brahmoism went forward in theory and practice and gave up more of ancient Hinduism than before. But even today, we think, it may correctly be said that Brahmoism tends to look upon itself as but a chip of the old block.

One of the latest but certainly not the least of such forward movements is Theosophy. Probably Theosophists will not agree to describe it as a reform movement in Hinduism. Theosophy, according to its best exponents, is a world movement, and if a reform at all, it is not a reform of Hinduism but of all religions. It aspires to become a world religion by assimilating and synthesising whatever is good in the religions of the world, by smoothing off their exclusive individualities and angularities, by rehabilitating the wisdom of the ancients and by adapting life to the fundamentals of that wisdom.

Without denying its claim to the status of a world-religion to which it aspires, it is permissible to point out that among the ancients upon whose wisdom Theosophy seeks to rebuild the structure of society and to base life, the Hindus occupy a place of honour. Theosophy reinterprets many of the concepts of Hinduism. And further, it accepts unaltered some of the ideas of Hindu philosophy and religion, such as those of reincarnation and karma.

If Hinduism is sufficiently liberalised and modernised, a merger of Hinduism in Theosophy is not inconceivable. What is certain is that the acceptance of Theosophy would imply a reform of existing Hinduism.

Now and again, here and there, great minds have risen within Hinduism who were alive to the changing conditions of life and who strove to revitalise Hindu society and religion. Ramakrishna and his great disciple Vivekananda are two among many such. The Mission which goes by the former's name and has ramifications all over the world, preaches what it conceives to be the quintessence of Hinduism. Nevertheless, it does not accept the whole of Hinduism but revises and reforms it.

In quite recent times, movements have been started to give a new tone to Hinduism more from the social than the credal side. The Hindu Mission in Bengal is one such. It aims to remove untouchability from Hindu society, to encourage inter-caste marriage and widow-remarriage and to promote other reforms felt to be imperative. There are similar movements in other parts of Hindusthan. But towering above all is India's Mahatma's *Harijan* movement. The agitation for the right to enter public temples and places of worship is an offshoot of it seeking to remove one of the many disabilities from which lower caste Hindus suffer.

We do not propose to enumerate all the reform movements that exist in Hinduism today. It is enough to know that the need for a new adaptation is recognised and that attempts are made now and then with that end in view.

Now, if Hinduism has allowed criticism of itself in the past and attempts to remodel itself in the present, is it not time that opposition to reform should cease and wider reforms on a larger scale should be effected? Political, social and economic problems are more complex now. Social reconstruction has become more urgent. A more courageous handling of the situation is necessary.

There was a time when in this land of plenty whole masses of men could live unaffected by political changes. The overthrow of an old dynasty at Delhi or the crowning of a new king at Murshidabad meant little for the men in distant villages. But times have changed. Men have come closer together. And no race or nation can remain unaffected by the presence of other races and by events taking place elsewhere; much less by things happening within its own territory. There was time when Hindudom thought the presence of Christians or Mussalmans in the country of no consequence to it. It is impossible to think so now—nay, it is suicidal.

The presence of new faiths and ideals and other communities, and contact with other civilisations and countries, imply an immense change. Hinduism must realise that what was suited to old times will not help in these conditions. The forces of

disruption are at work. Unless they are checked in time, the fabric of the old structure may give way beyond repair.

A higher synthesis and a larger whole which will include and absorb Hinduism, Islam and Christianity can alone give us an Indian nation. It is not an impractical ideal. But for it to become actual, not Hinduism only but all creeds and communities must reshape themselves or allow themselves to be reformed. Here, however, we are considering Hinduism in particular.

The Mussalman is a problem in India. He is not so in Russia or China or England. Why is he an almost baffling problem here? It is not his political past that is responsible, though of course, having been a ruler once, he will naturally refuse to be treated as an untouchable now. It is the Hindu theory of untouchability that keeps him out, but for that a closer association of the two communities might become a fact. The Normans went to England as conquerors but they were absorbed in English society. If the liberalising process started during Akbar's reign had continued to bear fruit, the history of India would have been different. But it cannot be said that the Hindus have no responsibility. Not only have they treated the Mussalman as an untouchable, but, while Buddha has found a place in the Hindu pantheon, Muhammad has received no such honour. Being a Hindu ourselves, we are not blind to the difficulties. We only desire to point out that the Hindus' paying like honour to Muhammad would solve the communal tangle.

Many Mussalmans are alive to the situation and anxious to bring about reconciliation. The Ahmadiyyas attempt it by recognising the prophethood of Hindu teachers like Krishna and Buddha along with Moses, Jesus and Muhammad. It is a bold step for which they suffer persecution and even ostracism. But cannot the Hindus reciprocate by accepting Muhammad as a seer and a teacher of truth? If scientific and philosophical truth can be accepted from a foreigner, why not spiritual truth also? In such matters, Theosophy takes perhaps the most liberal view, which others might well follow. Race, creed or clime is no bar to its acceptance of a teacher. Could not this liberal attitude become general?

The fact that so many attempts have been and are still being made to reform and to revitalise Hinduism proves that the need for reform is recognised. The chief question, therefore, is how best to effect it. The attempts made hitherto have often been fitful, sporadic and disorganised. Besides, it has sometimes happened that the reformer has allowed himself to be deified by his followers. Thus, instead of reforming Hinduism as a whole, he has started a new sect with himself as its founder-leader. We refrain from mentioning examples by name. Such is not the best means of reform,

even with the keenest desire for it. What is necessary is a rational and modern outlook.

The legislatures may be more extensively used for this purpose. They have been successfully employed in recent times for important reforms. Rights long denied have been conferred on scheduled castes. Marriage and property laws have been changed. And other laws are on the anvil. This is a happy sign. But we cannot overlook the hostility aroused. There are difficulties in using a mixed legislature for these purposes, but they are not insuperable and public opinion should be educated not only to withhold opposition but to support such efforts.

Attempts to control the holy places and public temples and to regulate the use of the immense properties belonging to the deities in them, have met with tremendous opposition. But a reform of these places is most urgently needed. What we wish done is what Jesus did in similar places. Without offence, it may perhaps be said that our holy places are often festering dens of much evil and ugliness. Yet they were intended and are still believed by many to be centres of the highest spiritual life.

The best preparation for reform and readjustment is ideological change. All concerted action should be in this direction. The greatest obstacle is undue glorification of the past and unjustified complacency with the present. We do not suggest that there was nothing to be proud of in our past and that we must feel unhappy over everything in the present. But we do demand criticism. Let praise be given wherever praise is due; but let fault also be found where fault is. This is the only attitude which may bring about the right sort of adjustment.

In the higher nationhood to which we aspire and the larger synthesis of creeds and communities which is India's goal, Hinduism will undoubtedly play an important part. It is well, therefore, that it should lead the way by shaping itself to the future that is to be.

U. C. BHATTACHARJEE

Up till now, Asia, with the exception of Japan, had played but a subordinate rôle in world problems. But it was as likely as it was desirable that the centre of gravity would gradually shift from the West to the East. A good measure of equality in the political and economic spheres was really a condition precedent of the desired co-operation of Asia. "I, for one, feel that in the peace settlement and reconstruction which will follow the cessation of the war, it would be practically impossible to withhold such rights from dependent Asiatic countries. This is not a pious hope, but a conviction based on the logic of circumstances as they are moving to-day."—N. R. SARKAR

(*The Hindu*, 9-1-43)

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

DHARMARAJA'S "VEDANTAPARIBHASA"

[We bring together here the reviews of two recently published translations of the same philosophical work of the Advaita school.—ED.]

Vedāntaparibhāṣā. By DHARMARĀJA ADHVARIN, edited with English translation by S. S. SURYANARAYANA SASTRI. (The Adyar Library Series No. 34. Adyar. Rs. 2/12)

The *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* of Dharmaraja has been rendered into English in this work by Mr. S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri, whose keen aptitude for philosophical works and whose remarkable skill in translating high technical phraseology into common English parlance are well known. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan's Foreword to such a book has considerably lightened and simplified the reviewer's task. Though Dharmaraja introduces his book as "One based on the content of the Vedanta for the instruction of the dull-witted" his work, in the absence of such a clear translation as Mr. Sastri's, would seem even at a casual glance to threaten augmenting immensely the difficulties of the dull-witted.

In a short review of such a book, it is impossible to do full justice to the author except by pointing out one or two leading features. The very detailed introduction and the copious notes appended make it easy for the reader to tackle the subject. Various controversial points have been raised and subtly clarified. For instance, in discussing whether mind is a sense organ or not, the apparent error that is likely to arise on the strength of the *Bhagavat Gita* reference to "sense organs with the mind as sixth" is refuted. In support, an illustration from the *Veda*, referring to the Yajamana as fifth is included among the Ritwiks, though not a Ritwik, and *Bharata* as the fifth *Veda*, though not a Veda by itself, is put forth as another argument. The Katha text quoted, that "objects are superior to sense organs and the mind is superior even to the sense organs" settles it once for all that mind is not a sense organ.

Secondly, there is clarification of the basic truths such as Moksha and other philosophical concepts. The place of Moksha among the four Purusharthas is distinctly brought out. "Anandatmaka Brahma Praptihi Moksha: Soka Nivritti." "Release is the attainment of Brahma of the nature of Bliss; it is also the removal of sorrows"; for there are such Sruti texts as "The knower" of Brahman becomes Brahman itself.

One feature that would interest modern practical-minded men and women is the statement that

> release is not, however, the attainment of some other world or some object-generated Bliss produced there; for that being non-eternal as something generated there is the contingency of fresh return for the released one.

Though this may be a controversial point, whether attainment of bliss "generated" by God's prasada or Grace is non-eternal, it gives sufficient consolation for this war-weary world of an everlasting peace in this world itself if

people make an earnest endeavour to live up to the ideals inculcated in the Vedanta.

The definition of terms like Sravana, Manana, Nididyasana and the assignment to them of their respective places in spiritual discipline are noteworthy. Though I cannot in a short space go into all the ramifications of the subject, the detailed examination of the six pramanas—Prathiksha (perception), Anumana (inference), Upamana (comparision), Sabdha (verbal testimony), Arthapathi (postulation), and Anupalabhdi (non-cognition), the admitted sources of Advaita philosophy—is sure to rouse the interest of the public.

A melancholy interest attaches to this review, for from *The Hindu* of the 11th December it is learnt that Professor S. S. Sastri has passed away. His death is undoubtedly a loss to the world of Indian philosophy.

M. A. RUCKMINI

Vedanta Paribhasa of Dharmaraja Adhvarindra. Translated by SWAMI MADHAVANANDA, with a Foreword by DR. S. N. DAS GUPTA. (Ramakrishna Mission Sarada Pitha, Belur Math, Howrah. Rs. 3/-)

This neatly got-up translation of *Vedānta Paribhāṣā*, an elementary text in Advaita Vedānta, is a welcome addition to this translation series of the Ramakrishna Mission. The aim is to popularise the literature of Advaita and to give a correct notion of it to laymen unacquainted with the original Sanskrit. It is high time for Indians to get a closer acquaintance with originals, since most translations suffer from a type of distortion that cannot be easily got over. Swami Mādhavānanda has presented a neat translation and one that does not suffer from too much literalness, which mars the beauty of translations made by modern scholars.

No one will deny that the Philosophy of Advaita can be understood only by those with a good grounding in the other five schools of Orthodox Philosophy. Advaita is an attempt to arrive at a synthesis of all the systems by showing their mutual contradictions in some aspect or other, thus entailing a transcendence over all the others. Phenomenal and Noumenal stand-points are clearly marked out, corresponding to the Realistic and Idealistic divisions of modern Philosophy. Phenomenally Advaita accepts the Samkhyan pariṇāma-vada: transcendentally it refutes it but accepts instead vivarta-vāda, a species of Asat-kārya-vāda of Nyāya-vaiśeshika. Phenomenally it accepts the akhyāti or non-observation theory of error of Sāmkhya; transcendentally it accepts the anyatha-khyāti (mal-observation) of Nyāya and calls its own brand anīrvacanīya-khyāti. Phenomenally it accepts the Dharma-kanda of Mīmāmsā, but transcendentally it refutes it as unhelpful. The Adrishta of Vaiśeshika becomes the Apūrva of Mīmāmsā and finally in Advaita it becomes the Māyā, the transcendentally illusory causal principle of Karma and avidyā. Advaita accepts all the pramāṇas or sources or means of right knowledge of the other schools, accepting as many as six. But this acceptance is limited to the phenomenal world of experience. The real and ultimate means is *anubhava*, transcendental experience born out of reflection on the fundamental Mahāvākyas like *Tat tvam asi, so'ham asmi* etc. Thus there is no wonder that Dharmaraja Adhvarindra has taken the realistic stand-point, as pointed out by Prof. S. N. Das Gupta, the well-known historian of Indian philosophy, in his Foreword.

The translator has given useful annotations and has furnished a glossary of epistemological terms which enhances the value of the publication.

K. C. VARADACHARI

OLD SCROLLS UNROLLED *

It is more accurate to say that a detailed and authoritative history of ancient India remains to be written than to say that such a history does not exist. Innumerable difficulties have conspired to make the writing of such a history extremely difficult, if not impossible. The great antiquity of India's historical and cultural traditions is by itself a major difficulty. Their indeterminate chronology is another. But when it is tacitly but erroneously assumed that no authoritative records exist for the construction of a reliable account of the ancient past, it is forgotten that the *Vedās*, the *Upanishads*, the epics and the *Puranas* contain a wealth of historical material. Too often this is ignored as fiction or philosophical allegory instead of an attempt's being made to sift history from these ancient writings.

No doubt, true history lies embedded in, and almost hopelessly mixed up with, myth, legend, allegory and romance, sometimes too much obscured behind the mist of centuries to be recognisable as authentic, but investigation will undoubtedly uncover valuable historical facts which await to be critically examined and collated. The *Vedās* are not merely pantheistic hymns in praise of the elemental forces of nature. The *Upanishads* are not merely moral and philosophical allegories. The *Purānas* and the epics again are not merely the glorifications of the impossible achievements of imaginary heroes. They sum up an entire civilization, vanished and lost to history. Rich with the wreckage of an ancient past, these works throb with the marvellous achievements of mighty men whom long distance in time has invested with a mythical romantic halo.

Shri Munshi has attempted in these lectures the difficult but engaging task of reconstructing the ancient history, not of the whole of India, but of his own province, Gujarāta, on the evidence of those ancient works. He proposes, in brief, to detect the first historical traces of the Aryanisation of India south of the Narmada and extending along the line of the western coast. He takes us far into the dimness of antiquity, beyond the dawn of traditional history, to a period when Gujarāta was a stretch of marshy land and Cutch still under water. References to that part of the country which we now call Gujarāta are not few in the *Vedās*, the epics and the *Purānas*. It is Shri Munshi's purpose to arrange those references so as to evolve an authentic account of the advent of the Aryans into Gujarāta.

For the sifting of the historical from the unhistorical, Shri Munshi has provided himself with an accepted critical method. The record of Purānic traditions and genealogies is accepted as reliable only if Vedic literature corroborates it or supplies the necessary corrective. Having been woven into contemporary records by persons having direct or indirect knowledge, the names, associations and synchronisms found in the *Mantrās* of the *Rigveda* afford undubitable evidence.

**The Early Aryans in Gujarata.* By K. M. MUNSHI, B. A., LL. B. (Thakkar Vassanji Madhavji Lectures Series. The University of Bombay. Re. 1/-)

The *Brāhmaṇas* and the *Upanishads* illuminate the passage which tradition and genealogies took in the process of their gradual incorporation into the Purānas.

The first historical outpost, however, is the Dāśarājña, the Battle of the Ten Kings described in the *Rigveda*. The earliest tradition about Aryans in Gujarāta is said to be older than the Dāśarājña, being associated with the Mānavas and the Bhrigus, both early tribes, the latter of whom claimed kinship with the Yayāti and the Śaryāti groups. Śaryāti Mānava is the first Aryan directly connected with Gujarāta as it received its name from his son Ānarta. Cyavana, whom the *Mahābhārata* repeatedly associates with Gujarāta was the son-in-law of Śaryāti the King of Ānarta. After these early tribes come the names of the Haihayas, residents of the Vindhyan plateaux—the region bounded on the north by the Jamuna and on the south by the Narmada. Vītāhavyās or Śrinjaya Vītāhavyās are generally admited to be the Vedic variants for the Haihayas and though the Vedic evidence is not detailed enough the Haihaya supremacy in Gujarāta finds ample corroboration. The paucity of evidence in this connection is explained by the now accepted fact that the earlier Vedic compositions were the work mostly of Aryans on the banks of the Saraswati and Drisadvati in Northern India, or the leaders of the "Inner Band" as Grierson calls them; and those writers did not or could not refer in great detail to the exploits and achievements of the tribes—the Outer Band—advancing far southwards. The *Purānas* are eloquent about the achievements of Arjuna Kārtavīrya, the mighty conqueror who raised the Haihaya power to its peak, invaded the territories round about the River Narmada, destroyed the Nāgas who were in occupation and raised out of the ruins the first Aryan city in Western India, the mighty Māhishmati, near modern Broach. Then follows the famous Bhrigu-Haihaya conflict, the story of Paraśurāma's retaliatory war against Arjuna Kārtavīrya, the death of the Haihaya hero, the razing of Mahishmati and the establishment of Śūrpāraka (modern Sopara near Bassein). The *Atharva Veda* completely corroborates the story of this huge conflict. Furious controversy has raged about it, but its historical actuality is hardly to be doubted from the fact that even today the Paraśurāma Kshetra is situated near Vajreshwari (about twenty-five miles from Bassein) and certain Brahmins in the Colaba and Ratnagiri Districts claim descent from Paraśurāma even to this day.

Subsequent history is still enveloped in the dust of controversy. Synchronising closely with the *Mantra* period, tentatively from about 1500 B. C. to 1000 B. C., there followed a dark and definite gap in the religious and literary traditions of the *Rigveda* and history has to restart with the composition of the *Aitareya* and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇas* shortly after the reign of Janamejaya Pārikshita. The existence of two Janamejayas has rendered difficult the task of fixing the distance of time which separated the second Janamejaya from the *Mantra* period.

To shorten as far as possible this intervening time, Shri Munshi hazards the not unplausible but highly disturbing conclusion that this Janamejaya Pārikshita is the great-grandson of the

Pāndavas of the *Mahābhārata*, a conclusion which lands him in a position from which the whole of the *Mahābhārata* cannot but be regarded only as a grand imaginative creation utterly divorced from historical truth. The conclusion that the great epic is purely imaginary and is built up entirely against the background of the Bhrigu-Haihaya conflict is particularly hard to accept in view of the investigations of no less a scholar than Dr. V. S. Sukthankar. Shri Munshi is, however, conscious of this questionable position and is open to correction, true scholar that he is, should further study and investigation upset his daring hypothesis.

Thus within the brief scope of a hundred pages is narrated the chequered history of ancient Gujarāta. We congratulate Shri Munshi on this achievement, and in closing wish to stress in his own concluding words :—

> ....a time has come when our history must be examined and written by us from our own point of view, from the point of view of our development and culture, our literature and art, our achievements. Our national history awaits to be written, and a Nation which seeks self-realization must undertake the work.

V. M. INAMDAR

The Bible and Its Background. By ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON. Vol. I, Old Testament. Vol. II, New Testament. (C. A. Watts and Co., Ltd., London. 2*s.* each volume)

The Old Testament in the World Church. By GODFREY E. PHILLIPS, M. A. (Lutterworth Press, London. 10*s.*)

A few years ago, Mr. H. G. Wells—that most forceful and provoking Titan of the literary world—startled the dovecots of orthodoxy by deprecating the exaggerated importance attached to Bible history in Western lands. Palestine and its people, he said, were a "side-show" in the greater conflicts of the ancient world and of no great importance in the history of civilization. Palestine must be seen in proportion. Naturally the orthodox were offended, for had not the central event in all history occurred on the sacred soil of Palestine, and were not the Jews the predestined preparers of this epochal event? Jesus was a Jew. And Jesus was God incarnate. Thus Palestine is uniquely and divinely significant. God chose the Jews.

Of the two writers whose books we notice, Mr. Archibald Robertson is a Wellsian who sees Palestine in perspective against the entire background of the Middle-Eastern world, and its sacred scriptures as a varied collection of writings born of the strivings and stresses of its people. Only within the context of history does the Old Testament come vividly and comprehensibly to life. It has value not as revelation but as a reflection of the fortunes and beliefs of a particular people whose story is deeply ingrained in the Westerner's mind.

Mr. Phillips stands in the opposite camp. Not Mr. Wells but Mr. Belloc is his literary affinity. "How odd of God to choose the Jews," reflects Mr. Belloc, believingly. Mr. Phillips also believes. The Jewish people, he says, is singled out for special treatment as a messenger to all the world since God in his Wisdom chose the Semites, not the Aryans, to be the medium of his revelation. Their story, as the Old Testament discloses it, is the opening chapter of a stupendous drama, "the developing plot of a story unfolding

towards Christ as its true meaning and climax." Somehow this story must be made comprehensible to the "babes" in Christ who are gathered into the younger churches in India, China and Africa, and especially to those who doubt whether the Old Testament with all its crudities and contradictions can fittingly be used as a means to evangelism. Many missionaries use the old Testament very little, and some use it wrongly. What then is its true function in this twentieth century?

Mr. Phillips has his answer. The Old Testament, he says, must be read in the light of the New, for only so can its full value become apparent. The Old Testament is an introduction to the New, "the opening part of the story of the world's salvation through Christ." Providence was operating long before Jesus was born: God raised up Moses who was the first John the Baptist who prepared the way for Christ. "If India were to reject the Old Testament," says Mr. Phillips, "she would be rejecting the real Jesus, her Saviour and the world's."

Mr. Phillips starts with an assumption: he assumes a unique, invasive Event in Palestine, and on the basis of this belief he interprets the entire tumultuous story of Hebrew development. This, in fact, is his clue to the whole history of religion; like many Westerners, he makes history of myth. He is entitled to his assumption of course; it is one that he shares with millions of Christians who have not his knowledge of Biblical criticism. What he is not entitled to is his manner of using the data and the theories of modern Biblical scholarship *selectively* in order to prove his own preconceived case. Mr. Robertson's book on the Old Testament provides a valuable corrective at the radical extreme.

Radical also is his volume on the New Testament which, like the other, is a marvel of compression. For the most part, the author lets facts speak for themselves; but he also has a clue, plausible if contentious:—

> The prophetical books of the Old Testament are poetry, and in parts great poetry. But unless we see them as the literature of a class struggle, we shall not understand the poetry. The Gospels are a wish-fulfilling myth of God made man—perhaps with a kernel of revolutionary history at its centre—. But unless we see the Gospels against the background of the struggle of the Jewish people and the submerged masses with Roman imperialism, we shall not understand the need which gave rise to the myth.

Palestine is important, but its importance can only be estimated against the changing background of history and in relation to other lands and peoples.

LESLIE BELTON

Studies on Some Concepts of the Alaṅkāra Śāstra. By V. RAGHAVAN, M. A., PH. D. (The Adyar Library Series No. 33. Adyar. Rs. 4/-)

With a Foreword by Dr. G. Srinivasa Murti, Honorary Director of the Library, this thirty-third volume in the Adyar Library Series contains studies on certain fundamental concepts of ancient Sanskrit literary criticism and literary patterns by Dr. V. Raghavan of the Department of Sanskrit at the University of Madras. These studies originally appeared in different technical periodicals and are now presented in book form.

The first study is a historical account of the definitions of a genuine literary work of art (Lakshana). The "Use and Abuse of Alaṅkāra" are elucidated in the second. "Svabhāvokti" (literary treatment of a subject as it is in its structural and functional manifestation in nature), "Bhāvika" (making the resurrected past and the anticipated future throb with life as if in the dynamic present) and "Riti" (stylistic characteristics and idiosyncrasies) get a study each. "Vritti" (expressional pattern) is then studied. Next comes a historical account of the concept of "Aucitya" (appropriateness, appositeness or relevancy). The next study deals with the different names of Sanskrit poetics. The concluding study is devoted to an analysis of "Camatkāra" (the distinctive emotional reaction to any fine work of art).

From the foregoing list of the different discussions summed up by Dr. Raghavan from the original Sanskrit sources, it will be realised that Dr. Raghavan has made an important contribution to correct understanding of the basic concepts of literary patterns and literary embellishment adopted by Sanskrit classicists. There are, however, certain *obiter dicta* of Dr. Raghavan's on which undoubtedly reviewers would be expected to comment.

Towards the conclusion of the study on "Use and Abuse of Alankara," Dr. Raghavan remarks, "Nature is the creation of God's Līlā, poetry, of the poet's Līlā." Such exaggerations as these are as plentiful as blackberries in the writings of many of the Sanskrit poets. While it would be impossible to deny the poet his place in the sun or that poetry and poetic imagery should be appreciated by persons of cultured sensibility, the poet should at the same time be shown his proper place in the scheme of things. Literary criticism ancient or modern should be strictly controlled by rationalistic canons and discipline, and it must then be observed that even in the wildest and most ecstatic moments of poetic imagination no creation of a poet, not even his *magnum opus*, can stand comparison with God's Līlā! That is why a ban is rightly contemplated on poetry and poets. ("Kavyalaapamscha-varjayet.")

Further, a statement which occurs in Dr. Raghavan's discussion of the concept of "Aucitya" makes one very nearly despair of poetry altogether! "The poet," writes Dr. Raghavan,

> takes up even Anaucitya to make Aucitya out of it. The poet's attitude is as free and open as in respect of the question of morality in poetry.

There is no doubt a universal reign of relativity; nevertheless, there are certain permanent standards which must be observed by all, poets and non-poets, even prosaic critics like the present reviewer! If Dr. Raghavan holds that "there is no absolute Guṇa

and Doṣa but only Ucita and Anucita," even the latter do not escape the iron grip of relativity. If, further, Dr. Raghavan argues that even inappositeness can be transformed by poetic alchemy into appositeness, he makes the basic concept of "Aucitya" contingent on poetic imagination, possibly on poets' whims and idiosyncrasies. The correct position rather is that there is a permanent background of Æsthetic Reality to which even the imagination of poets must conform.

I do not think the citation from Robert Bridges improves matters. A court bird can bear false witness and give out a perfectly apposite story without being dislodged from his position even by the cleverest and acutest of cross-examining criminal lawyers. Even so, in describing a saturnalia of drunken criminals the poet's imagination may have the freest play, but the inapposite can never be transformed into the apposite. Before æsthetic judgment is pronounced, it is obligatory to mark the boundaries of the specific universe of discourse, or the sphere concerned and the concepts of *aucitya* and *anaucitya* must have sway only within its jurisdiction. Then I do not believe it would be possible for the poet or the poet's imagination to transform the inapposite in any given sphere into the apposite in the same sphere. If different spheres are contemplated, the concepts themselves cease to apply. For what is inapposite in one sphere may well be apposite in another, so that the poet and his imagination would never succeed in transforming the former into the latter.

These comments may not touch the general excellence of Dr. Raghavan's treatment, nor would they deter one from congratulating the Adyar Library on this publication.

R. Naga Raja Sarma

Monkey. By Wu Ch'eng-en. Translated from the Chinese by Arthur Waley. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Serious ideas are set forth side by side with overwhelming nonsense....The riotous license of his mirth is restrained neither by decency nor by reverence....All assumes the form of allegory; those who have no taste for allegory cannot appreciate Rabelais.

Thus Sir Walter Besant on the great Frenchman who produced his immortal work at about the same time that the Chinese scholar Wu Ch'êng-ên was composing his own masterpiece. And all that is said of Rabelais applies with equal truth to the author of the *Hsi Yu Chi*, or Journey to the West, parts of which are here translated by our modern Urquhart, Mr. Arthur Waley.

The story has been called the Buddhist *Pilgrim's Progress*, based as it is on the journey to India undertaken in the seventh century by the monk Hsüan-tsang, also known as "Tripitaka," in quest of the Buddhist Scriptures. But apart from this, there is nothing historical in the *Hsi Yu Chi:* all is pure fiction (with an underlying allegorical motive) of the most fantastic character, and its real hero is not Tripitaka himself but the fabulous monkey who becomes his disciple and accompanies him on his pilgrimage. The opening chapters, indeed, are entirely devoted to the supernatural origin and mischievous exploits of this strange creature, who has acquired stupendous magical powers and uses them to throw the whole Buddhist and

Taoist pantheon into a turmoil. He is finally quelled by the serene influence of Buddha, and only after five hundred years' imprisonment in a mountain is he released at the instance of Tripitaka, to whom he soon gives proof of his devotion by invaluable help in many directions. Meanwhile other converts have been made; a demon with snout and tusks, whose licentious conduct had led to his downfall from heaven, receives the name of Pigsy; a fierce dragon becomes a white horse to bear the pilgrim on his way; and a hostile river-monster is won over to the faith and known henceforth as Sandy. Such is the curiously assorted little company that after much scheming and cursing, laughing and jesting, and desperate encounters with all sorts of enemies, succeed in reaching the goal at last. The tale is spun out to an immense length with a succession of adventures, both hair-raising and grotesque; but Mr. Waley has contented himself with translating rather less than a third of the whole. His racy style, sown with broad colloquialisms, admirably preserves the Rabelaisian flavour of the Chinese original.

And what of the allegory? Though never obtruded, one feels it subtly suggested throughout, giving coherence and meaning to what might otherwise appear to be a hap-hazard jumble of episodes. It is the old yet ever-fascinating story of the upward progress of the human soul, in which Monkey represents the active intellect or, in Mr. Waley's phrase, "the restless instability of genius," Pigsy brute strength and the animal appetites, and Sandy the passive side of man's nature. Near the end of the book, when they are crossing the last of the rivers, a corpse is seen drifting rapidly down-stream. Tripitaka is alarmed, but the others congratulate him, saying: "It's you, Master. That dead body is your old self." A few minutes later, he stepped lightly out of the boat: "He had discarded his earthly body; he was cleansed from the corruption of the senses, and his was now the transcendent wisdom that leads to the Further Shore."

LIONEL GILES

Indian Architecture (*Buddhist and Hindu Periods*). By PERCY BROWN. (D. B. Taraporevala Sons and Co., Bombay. Rs. 19/-)

Handbooks fulfil a double task. They are not only guides for students and reference books for scholars, but also milestones of the progress of science. For, although they cannot catalogue all the detailed results of preceding research, they must at least draw its general sum, showing what has already been accomplished and what is still left to be done.

For years the history of Indian architecture has been in urgent need of such a new handbook. The existing standard works not only have become antiquated as a result of the archæological discoveries of the last decades, but also are not up to our modern methodological standards. J. Fergusson's monumental *History of Indian Architecture*, re-edited in 1910, was merely a first tentative classification. E. B. Havell's books of 1913 and 1915 (reprinted in 1927) have done the greatest service to Indian art by rediscovering to mankind its forgotten sublime beauty, but also a hardly less

disservice by their abstruse theories.

The gap is now being filled by Mr. Percy Brown, Curator of the Victoria Memorial Hall and former Principal of the Calcutta School of Arts. The present first volume, which is to be followed by another dealing with the architecture of the Islamic period, reveals all the virtues of his former books, industrious compilation of facts, sober and cautious judgment and clear exposition, indeed the very virtues demanded of such a handbook. Mr. Percy Brown, moreover, offers not merely a summary of our present-day knowledge of Indian architecture, but has incorporated also much of his own research.

Among the striking features are the many (46 of 118 well-executed plates) splendid reconstructions and comparative tables illustrating the development of ground-plans and elevations, columns, arches, roofs, śikharas, etc. Drawn by Babu N. D. Ray after the author's sketches, they make the understanding of many complicated aspects really easy. Most interesting amongst them are the reconstructions of Vedic and other early domestic prototypes of religious stone architecture.

As a matter of fact, these early chapters are the most illuminating of the whole book. In the part dealing with Mediæval architecture the outline loses much of this clearness. The treatment of the so important transition period from the Gupta to the later North Indian, as well as from the Chalukya to the Hoysala style is somewhat meagre. The links connecting Paharpur on the one side with Masrur and Kashmir, on the other with Greater India, are hardly mentioned. The same must be said of the wood architecture of Nepal and its relations with Kanishka's stupa as well as with the Far East. The shrines of the Himalaya between Kashmir and Nepal should not have been quite omitted nor certain interesting temples leading over to the Hoysala style, such as the Belagami group. Of the great sanctuaries in Bengal, Orissa, Central India and Rajputana the author tries to trace the chief characteristics, but much still remains in the dark. Finally, hardly anything is to be found on the domestic and military architecture since the Kushana period, and perhaps also something more about the dominating influence of India on the architecture of Burma, Thailand, Malaya, Java and Cambodia might not have been out of place.

It would, however, be unjust to lay all these shortcomings at the door of the author, for most of them represent gaps in the research hitherto conducted. It is certain that Mr. Percy Brown's valuable book will become, for the next decades, the generally accepted reference work on Indian architecture and that its very shortcomings will be a guide to our scholars where to set in with future researches.

H. GOETZ

Kashmir : The Playground of Asia : A Handbook for Visitors to the Happy Valley. By SACHCHIDANANDA SINHA, D.LITT., BAR-AT-LAW. (Ram Narain Lal, Allahabad. Rs. 3/8)

Dr. Sinha has compiled a multipurpose book with such admirable thoroughness as to lay both his special public and the general reader under a real debt of gratitude to him. In less

than 350 pages, he has organised for us a combined history, geography, gazetteer, directory and bibliography of Kashmir. He disarms criticism in advance by calling it a guide-book; but it is evident that he is thoroughly under the spell of the *genius loci* of the world's loveliest play-ground. The tourist, rich or poor, native or foreign, who elects Kashmir for a change from the more sophisticated call of better advertised rivals will find in the book not merely a guide, but also a philosopher and a friend.

The work is so obviously a labour of love that it might seem ungracious to criticise it for not being differently planned. The very multiplicity of accessory prosaic tips so generously provided in it almost threatens to make a toil of a pleasure. The arm-chair travellers—the holiday-makers in imagination, the more numerous and blest of us, have no use at all for the statistical part of the book. That these count in the author's estimation is evident from the thoughtful provision of the third section, "Descriptive and Reflective," for their exclusive benefit. The author is at his best here, describing the sights and recording his impressions of the lovely scenes of Kashmir, of its rivers, lakes, gardens and sublime Himalayan heights brooding in snowy silence over all the landscape. The author becomes lyrical without effort, and conveys something of the beauty of Nature in love with itself.

The book is well got up and is enriched with numerous photographs of the beauty-spots in the happy valley. But the proofs have not received the care which they deserve in a book otherwise so carefully produced.

It is rare for busy publicists in our country to unbend in letters either for their own relief or for the delectation of a public too often condemned to behold them in one monotonous pose. It is happily otherwise with Dr. Sinha who in this book returns to his original love of letters from excursions in the world of affairs.

P. MAHADEVAN

WAR IDEOLOGY

Apart from the verbal protestations of the major combatants, there is nothing to distinguish their war ideologies. Both believe in out-bombing one another and expect, out of the smoking ruins of a civilisation, the emergence of perennial peace. It is hardly likely therefore that the message which India has for the world can reach the deafened ears of the West today.

Sir S. Radhakrishnan expounded that message in his recent Kamala Lectures at the Calcutta University, defending the philosophical soundness of the Gandhian ideology. He believed, we think quite rightly, that India—if only she were free to lead—would show the way towards the elimination of the war spirit. Commenting on that mission *The Indian Social Reformer* of 19th December remarks editorially :—

> If India, like the monk, Telemachus, who put an end to gladiatorial fights in ancient Rome by throwing himself between the rival combatants, though he himself was stoned to death by the infuriated spectators for interfering with their enjoyment, can stop future wars by an act of self-immolation, it will be in the line of her ancient tradition.

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____*ends of verse*
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

It is a long step in the right direction to recognise the present confusion and the need for co-ordination of the different branches of knowledge. The health of society depends upon mutual co-operation and free circulation of ideas. The statement issued a few months ago by the hundred American scholars who attended the Third Annual Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion at New York is pregnant with great possibilities. Its framers look upon the tragic developments of our time as "in large part the ultimate effects of world-wide intellectual confusion and spiritual and moral deterioration." And they urge the necessity of "bringing into focus the spiritual and intellectual resources available to us." *The New York Times* published their statement, from which we quote:—

> It has been clear for more than a generation that the advances in human knowledge in special fields were not being correlated with one another, or with the great inherited body of accepted truth, or with the emerging value judgments necessary to preserve and further civilization.

They see the clarification of goals as necessary, and "the co-ordination of vast fields of human experience beyond military, political and economic interests." Also they recognise that a civilisation in which "various fields of creative thought are integrally related and yet autonomous" is not to be brought into being by wishing for it. They propose fellowships under the guidance of the Conference for study by men and women of vision of how to improve "the technique of intercourse among the fields of learning and human experience."

The Conference has made a good beginning and its breadth of outlook, its distinguished membership and its representative character lend hope of fruitful results. Its steering committee of directors includes a Jewish Rabbi and a Negro Professor of Philosophy, educationists, scientists, writers, Government officials and men of affairs.

When THE ARYAN PATH was launched in 1930 we set down for our guidance certain desiderata in various domains which we considered merited support. Among such desiderata, it may be of interest to mention, we gave a prominent place to these, which the Conference's findings definitely subserve:—

> That which tends to unite specialists in different fields to pool their special knowledge in a common fund and thus provide a body of *unified* sciences—Knowledge.
>
> That which tends to bring into existence a philosophy of modern science, *i. e.*, to bring to light principles and fundamentals common to scientific thought in different branches; especially those which emphasise the humane phases of scientific labour.

The article by Dr. C. E. M. Joad which the *Evening Standard* published recently under the somewhat misleading title "Joad Goes Back to God!"

does not represent so sudden a right-about as the exclamation implies. An attitude of mind does not spring up overnight; it must always represent an extension of previously existing ideas. The articles which Dr. Joad has been contributing to THE ARYAN PATH over several years offer an illuminating study in ideological development.

In this latest article in the *Evening Standard* Dr. Joad explains what has led him to retake his ontological soundings. One consideration is the conviction that we have seen growing, "that what the mystics tell us may be true." Another is the recognised need to make provision in his scheme for moral experience. This is a line of thought in which Madame Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* undoubtedly played its part. His article in THE ARYAN PATH for February 1936, "God's Responsibility and Man's Freedom," was based upon his study of that work. There is a more logical and satisfying issue to his present dilemma than feeling driven by the fact of evil into acceptance of "a benevolent and participating God." It was pointed out in the "Note" appended to that article, in which the position of *The Secret Doctrine* on Good and Evil was summarised; he and others like him may be ready to see it.

In a nutshell, that solution is: There are no Good and Evil in the moral sense below the human kingdom but only Spirit and Matter as two contrasted aspects of the One Life. Human self-consciousness bestows freedom of choice; selfish choice disturbs equilibrium; restoration of equilibrium involves pain; pain becomes a teacher. It is as simple as that; but the ramifications are infinite.

The Soviet Scientists' Anti-Fascist Committee sent a most interesting message to Sir C. V. Raman, President of the Indian Academy of Sciences. (*The Hindu*, 7th December). With it came an article which reviews the multifarious activities of Russian scholars in Indological research. Pre-Revolutionary Russia paid a good deal of attention to Sanskritic studies, it is said. Among notable achievements were the publication of an unabridged Sanskrit dictionary and a number of ancient manuscripts. The endeavours of scholars like Oldenburg embraced a vast field in ancient and medieval Sanskrit literature, folklore, history, archæology and culture. A number of scholars devoted themselves to the study of Buddhism.

The present generation of Russian Indologists, however, is reported to be devoting more and more attention to modern Indian languages and literatures and to Indian history. The translating of works like the *Ramayana* of Tulsi Das and the compiling of dictionaries of modern Indian languages is proceeding apace.

The message, it is explained, is prompted by a desire

> ...to strengthen and further contact with fellow-scientists abroad...[and] to organise mutual exchange of information about the progress of science in other countries.

But it is also stated that "the Russian public has been manifesting great interest in Indian culture and literature."

For the sake of mutual understanding, such interest in any aspect of Indian intellectual life is welcome. Mutual understanding, however, does not surely mean only acquaintance with each other's books. An intimate understanding of the deeper aspirations of

the two peoples, and sympathy with and co-operative help in the nobler struggles in which either of them is engaged, can more effectively weld them together. The nobility of the sentiments which have actuated the present message to Sir C. V. Raman is unmistakable and gives room for hope that Russia will be greatly helpful in giving to the ill-informed and misinformed West a more correct idea about the workings of the contemporary Indian mind in every department of life.

The Nationalist (Indian) Christian Party's Executive Committee did well to remind their co-religionists that "the birth of Christ in a stable symbolises humility and self-sacrifice." Especially in this great crisis for our Motherland and the world, the traditional pomp and splendour of the Christmas season would not be seemly. Rejoicing at the birth of Christ, they conceded, was in order, but they urged simplicity and sobriety. They warned especially against the alcoholic indulgence which every right-thinking person must regard as profanation of any sacred festival. "Let us remember," the Committee urged,

> the poor and needy, who suffer from want of the bare necessities of life and let us also fraternise with our brethren belonging to other communities as children of one God.

This Christmas Message sounded the right note. We should like especially to see the Committee's last injunction taken to heart by everyone in India. The duty which it lays upon Christians rests no less upon us all. Sectarianism, dividing man from man, is a crime against humanity, under whatever name it be propagated. That alone is true religion which binds all men in a common brotherhood.

Mr. B. J. Wadia, Vice-Chancellor of the Bombay University, also struck the right note in his New Year's message to *Rast-Rahabar*, progressive Parsi weekly. He urged not only a comprehensive policy of reform, broad-minded but not precipitate. He recommended also that *Rast-Rahabar* emphasise "what does not require to be preached so much as to be practised, that Parsis too are Indians first and Indians last."

> If we could only talk a little less, fight among ourselves a little less, combine a little more and think a little more of the country than of the community, we could always keep our heads high above water, and carry on.

That prescription for the diminutive but far from insignificant Parsi community deserves wide application. If every son of India would say "I am an Indian before I am a Hindu or a Mussalman, a Christian or a Jain, a Sikh or a Jew," the very force of our united will would sweep us irresistibly to freedom.

There is a lesson for others than Parsis also in Mr. Wadia's warning against making ancestral prestige do duty for present effort, "continually basking in the sunshine of our great-grandfathers." We fully recognise that the breaking down of the false standard that considers honest toil demeaning is a *sine qua non* of national, economic and social health.

The passing of resolutions at annual conferences may mean little, Mr. H. B. Richardson, Education Minister of Holkar State, warned the educationists at Indore on 27th December. Their work must bear fruit. If the ideals formulated at that conference could be realised in practice it would be well for India, well for the world. The occasion was the joint session of the Eighteenth

All-India Educational Conference and the Third Indian Adult Education Conference. Educational objectives and educators' responsibility were specially stressed. The objectives were variously stated but were not mutually contradictory.

The maximum adaptation of each to his environment was the terse formulation of H. H. Maharaja Sir Vikram Sinha Rao Puar in his Inaugural Address. This is unexceptionable if by man be understood more than his mere material self and, by environment, more than the things he sees.

Mr. Richardson, President of the Reception Committee, offered physical, mental and spiritual development as the educational goal. He brought out too the need for the co-operative spirit and for education to weave individuals into a living pattern of creative activity for the benefit of all.

Pandit Amaranatha Jha, Vice-Chancellor of Allahabad University, urged, in his Presidential Address, stressing moral and spiritual enlightenment, especially in adult education. "The final aim of education in all its stages" he formulated as being

> to train the mind and the practical capabilities so as to subserve the higher and permanent needs of the spirit; to produce an urge for service; to make one a source of happiness to oneself, to one's family, neighbours and society; to render life beautiful and to prevent ugliness in thought and action; to attain wisdom and the even-balanced soul.

The first phrase could be interpreted to include what we hold to be a *sine qua non* of true education. But generalisations sometimes leave in doubt what requires to be plainly stated. True education must produce *free* men, vigorous and liberal minds. Children must be strictly trained in accurate and independent thought, free from all prejudices of race or caste or creed. Most truly was it stated in the Inaugural Address :—

> Victory over poverty, distress, disunion—whether ideological, communal or provincial—would be a much greater victory than anything which may be achieved by our armed forces. Indeed, it is perhaps not too much to say that wars are created or prevented in the classroom; for it is the ideas implanted in the individual mind at an early age which decide men's attitude towards life and their fellow-men. If this is so,—and I believe it to be so,—then the future lies more in the hands of educationists than of any one else.

The address of Dr. George K. C. Yeh, Counsellor of the Chinese Embassy at London, to the East India Association, on "India and China" appears in *The Asiatic Review* (October 1942). He gave Buddhism a high place among formative influences on China. The way had been paved by Taoism, which not only had awakened religious speculation but had hinted that

> something undefined, something that could fill life and eternity with light and hope... was to come from the distant wonderlands of the West, which in those days referred generally to the countries in Central Asia and what was then known as T'ien-chu, the old name for India.

He credited the personal influence of Indian monks in China with creating the best type among Chinese monks, "that type of holy dignity combined with nobility." But the distinction that he drew between Chinese and Indians in relation to religion echoed a common misapprehension. "The Chinese," he said, were "rarely able to lead a life entirely given up to religion such as exemplified by Hindus and Buddhists in India." This he attributed to "the staying influence of Confucianism," which had made the Chinese so practical-minded."

Sir Atul Chatterjee did well to challenge the implication that little attention had been paid by Buddhists in India to worldly affairs and material things:—

In a study of Indian history it would be found that the great Maurya dynasty were Buddhists from Asoka downwards, and these certainly did not forget the practical side of life. The same was true of other dynasties—the Pala dynasty, for example, which ruled for four hundred years in Bengal and Bihar—they were strongly Buddhist...but they also took full cognizance of the world needs of their day.

Dr. Yeh disclaimed meaning to imply "that their Indian friends were unable to attend to practical affairs of life." But it cannot be overstressed that the ideal of the great Indian thinkers, Buddhist or Hindu, has never been retirement from the world. It has ever been the living of the spiritual life in the world, doing whatever has to be done with devotion and detachment.

In another address at the same meeting Prof. Gordon Luce, recently of Rangoon University, bore witness to the predominantly idealistic nature of India's influence.

Dr. Yeh had said that there was something matter-of-fact—he thought he used the phrase "a little hard"—about the Chinese temperament. The same was true of the Burman and also of the Thai peoples. There was certainly something lacking on the spiritual plane until Indian influence, and particularly Buddhism, came there. That was a historical fact, borne out by many instances. One had only to see what happened when Indian influence came. It came to Champa in Annam, and the result was the great art centre of Misön. It came to Camboja, and the result was Angkor. It came to Java, and the result was Boro-Budur. It came to Burma, and the result was Pagan. It came to China, and the result was Yün-Kang and Lung-mên. Here, surely, the Far East owed a tremendous debt to India such as it could never repay.

The one problem which is occupying the attention of the leaders of thought all over the world is that of peace—of post-war reconstruction. Mr. Wendell Willkie's "final comment on imperialism," recently published in *The Times*, is necessarily disconcerting to imperialist thinking. He was eloquent on the futility of dreams of Anglo-American hegemony. He disagrees profoundly with the theory that the future peace must be built "around the ridge-pole of British-American relations." There could be no hope of lasting peace unless narrow prejudices were overcome, ideas reoriented and Eastern nations hailed at the Peace-Table as equals. "The main point," he said, "is this":—

Health, peace and security for all of us depend on just and equal settlement with the Far, Middle and Near East. This is what Versailles did not do. We must do it.

The new internationalism he envisages is to be economic and not primarily political. These are basic universal considerations but of no less practical significance were "some plain words" which Mr. Willkie addressed to America, all against separatism and for the unity and brotherhood of nations and of men. Whenever the search for someone else to blame for conditions or events is suspended long enough to turn the searchlight within, there is hope.

We talk about defects the British must cure. Well, there is a lot of house-cleaning we have to do. We have to revise all our ideas about the place of Negroes in American life.

Only one familiar with the Negro problem in the U. S. A. can appreciate the courage of this statement by a political aspirant. It is proof positive

of the writer's good faith. So is his flouting of the sacrosanct Monroe Doctrine when he demands the giving up of "dreams of merely hemisphere security." So is his attack on big business in demanding the abandonment of the United States' exclusive tariff policy. Is Mr. Roosevelt, in his concern for the international proprieties, letting the moral leadership of his people pass into braver hands?

The war has made one thing indisputable: that unless the reordering of the world after the war is on the basis of international understanding and good-will there is very little hope of a bright future for humanity. The Federal Union Movement naturally reflects the present intellectual ferment. None will disagree with the Federal Unionists when they propose, as in a recent Anglo-American manifesto, "extending the pledge of statehood in this Union to all other peoples who are prepared to give the guarantees of individual freedom." Nor should any disagree with their opposition to imperialism in all its forms.

The anxiety of the Federal Unionists therefore to have "an all-inclusive international organization" is understandable but not the mention of India among the nations who are asked to take a lead in the matter. This betrays a sad lack of knowledge about India's status and freedom of action. A nation unfree to order her own house, however advanced culturally or intellectually, can hardly give a lead in such a matter.

Further, "limitation of national sovereignty" is easy to demand but its reconciliation with maximum national autonomy will call for the highest statesmanship and a concern for the commonweal most rare among powerful States. If such a federation can ever succeed it must be on the strength not of international coercive sanctions but of sincere general conviction that force is not a permanently effective way of settling differences or cementing union. Arbitration and mutual understanding, based on the recognition of our common humanity, alone can establish and maintain amity and goodwill.

Prof. Gilbert Murray recognises, it seems to us rightly, that the most effective and practicable international system would leave complete national freedom outside "a series of definite agreed obligations" unanimously accepted. He visualises this as rendered more effective by precautionary plans against wars, by economic agreements and by provisions for a proper enforcement of international law.

Mr. Bernard Shaw seems unduly pessimistic in thinking the dreams of Federal Union beyond the present political capacity of man. His federation of nations on a "psychological" basis—in effect on the basis of East and West—is convenient geographically but pregnant with dangerous possibilities of racial wars. Mr. Julian Huxley sees security in enforcing peace through an international security organisation with adequate inspecting powers. Mr. Amery offers hopefully to the post-war world "the system of free co-operation, political, economic and cultural, which we have developed in the British Commonwealth, involving no constitutional impairment of national sovereignty"!

The Federal Unionists believe "that Man holds within himself, through mind and soul, the power of growth and promise of development." We pin more faith on that than on an artificial linking together of nations without the fusion that warmth of mutual feeling alone makes possible.